arXiv:1007.1124v3 [math.PR] 13 Feb 2012

ON THE STOCHASTIC BEHAVIOR OF OPTIONAL PROCESSES UP TO RANDOM TIMES

CONSTANTINOS KARDARAS

Abstract. In this paper, a study of random times on filtered probability spaces is undertaken. The main message is that, as long as distributional properties of optional processes up to the random time are involved, there is no loss of generality in assuming that the random time is actually a randomized stopping time. This perspective has advantages in both the theoretical and practical study of optional processes up to random times. Applications are given to the stochastic behavior of processes up to times of overall maximum and last-passage times in the context of downwards drifting Lévy processes with no positive jumps, as well as downwards transient diffusions.

Introduction

Discussion. Consider a filtered measurable space $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$, where $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is a right-continuous filtration, as well as an underlying sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ over Ω such that $\mathcal{F} \supseteq \mathcal{F}_\infty := \bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathcal{F}_t$, where the last set-inclusion may be strict. A *random time* is a $[0, \infty]$-valued, $\mathcal{F}$-measurable random variable. The interplay between random times and the filtration $\mathbf{F}$ goes a long way back, with the pioneering work of [1], [5], [33] — see also the volume [18]. Interest in random times has been significant, especially in connection with applications in financial mathematics, such as reduced-form credit risk modeling — see, for example, [9], [21] and [17].

A common approach to *constructing* random times is via the use of randomized stopping times (also called *Cox's method* — see [22]). Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be a probability on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, and suppose that there exists an $\mathcal{F}$-measurable random variable U that is stochastically independent of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ and has the standard uniform law under $\mathbb{Q}$. For a given $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, right-continuous and nondecreasing process $K = (K_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ such that $0 \leq K \leq 1$, define the random time $\psi := \inf \{ t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid K_t \geq U \}$, where by convention we set $\psi = \infty$ if the last set is empty. For such a duple $(\psi, \mathbb{Q})$, we say that ψ is a *randomized stopping time* on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$. Randomized stopping times have several noteworthy properties:

Date: February 15, 2012.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G07, 60G44.

Key words and phrases. Random times; randomized stopping times; times of maximum; last passage times.

The author would like to thank Monique Jeanblanc for valuable input, as well as Dan Ren for a careful reading of the manuscript and many constructive comments. Partial support by the National Science Foundation, grant number DMS-0908461, is gratefully acknowledged.

- The independence of U and $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ implies that $\mathbb{Q}[\psi > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = 1 - K_t$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Therefore, $1 - K$ represents the conditional survival process associated to ψ under *any* probability $\mathbb{Q}$ which makes U and $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ independent. The latter fact is useful in modeling — for example, since $\mathbb{Q}[\psi \leq t] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}[K_t]$ holds for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\mathbb{Q}$ can be chosen in order to control the unconditional distribution of ψ, while keeping the conditional survival probabilities fixed.
- Although ψ is not a stopping time on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$, it is in some sense very close to being one. Indeed, ψ is a stopping time of an initially enlarged filtration, defined as the right-continuous augmentation of $(\mathcal{F}_t \vee \sigma(U))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$. Importantly, due to the independence of U and $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ under $\mathbb{Q}$, each martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$ is also a martingale on the space with the enlarged filtration — in other words, the immersion property ([32], [11], also called hypothesis $(\mathcal{H})$ in [5]) holds. This opens the door to major theoretical analysis of such random times using tools of martingale theory.
- From a more practical viewpoint, it is straightforward to simulate processes up to time ψ under $\mathbb{Q}$. One first simulates a uniform random variable U; then, in an independent fashion, one continues with simulating the process K until the point in time that it exceeds U, along with other processes of interest.

In view of the usefulness of randomized stopping times, it is natural to explore their generality. Of course, it is not possible that an arbitrary random time is a randomized stopping time, since for the latter there is a need for the extra "randomization" coming from the uniform random variable. There is a further, more fundamental reason that an arbitrary random time cannot be realized as a randomized stopping time. Typically, for a random time ρ on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$, the nonnegative process $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{P}[\rho > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ fails to be nonincreasing, which would have to be the case if ρ was a randomized stopping time on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Nevertheless, the main message of the paper is the following:

> With a given a pair $(\rho, \mathbb{P})$ of a random time ρ and a probability $\mathbb{P}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F})$, one can *essentially* associate a pair $(\psi, \mathbb{Q})$, where $\mathbb{Q}$ is a probability on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ and ψ is a randomized stopping time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$, such that for *any* $\mathbf{F}$-optional process Y, the law of $(Y_{\rho \wedge t})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is identical to the law of $(Y_{\psi \wedge t})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$.

Therefore, as long as distributional properties of optional processes on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$ under $\mathbb{P}$ *up* to the random time ρ are concerned, there is absolutely no loss of information in passing from $(\rho, \mathbb{P})$ to the more workable pair $(\psi, \mathbb{Q})$.

There is a reason for the qualifying "essentially" in the claim that the above association can be carried out. To begin with, $\mathcal{F}$ should be large enough to support a random variable U that will be independent of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ under $\mathbb{Q}$. This is hardly a concern; if the original filtered space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F})$ is not rich enough, one can always enlarge it in a minimal way, without affecting the structure of $\mathbf{F}$, in order to make the previous happen. However, there is another, more technical obstacle. As will be argued in Section 1 of the text, what is guaranteed is the existence of a nonnegative local martingale L on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $L_0 = 1$ that is a candidate for a local (through a specific localizing sequence of stopping times) density process of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. Then, an argument ensuring that a consistent family of probabilities constructed in ever-increasing sigma-algebras has a countably additive extension to the limiting sigma-algebra is needed. Such an issue has appeared in different contexts in stochastic analysis — see [13], [23], [6]. Under appropriate topological assumptions on the underlying filtrations — for example, working on canonical path-spaces as discussed in [25] — one can successfully construct a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ out of L.

The aforementioned purely technical issue notwithstanding, the usefulness of the above philosophy is evident. In fact, as will be made clear in the text, even if the probability $\mathbb{Q}$ cannot be constructed, the representation pair consisting of the process K in the definition of ψ and the local martingale L on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ encodes significant information regarding the structure of random times.

In order to carry out the above-described program in practice, given a random time ρ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ one needs to identify the pair (K, L) associated with ρ. There are indeed formulas in the paper that provide (K, L) in terms of the process $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{P}[\rho > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ of conditional survival probabilities of ρ, as well as the optional compensator on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ of the nondecreasing process $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho \leq t\}}$. Although closed-form expressions for the previous quantities are not always available, they do exist for important cases of random times — this is, for example, the case when times of maximum and last-passage times for a wide class of models are considered. In order to illustrate the applicability of the theoretical results, extensive discussion is provided in the paper for times of maximum and last-passage times regarding the cases of infinite time-horizon downwards drifting Lévy processes with no positive jumps, infinite time-horizon downwards transient diffusions, as well as finite time-horizon Brownian motion with drift.

Structure of the paper. This introductory part ends with general remarks that will be used throughout the text. In Section 1, the canonical pair of processes associated with a random time is introduced, and certain of its properties are explored in both Section 1 and Section 2. Section 3 deals with a rigorous statement of the main message of the paper, regarding the law of optional processes up to random times. Section 4 contains some first examples. The remaining three sections contain applications for the cases of time of maximum and last-passage (or last-exit) times. Section 5 deals with downwards transient Lévy processes with no positive jumps, and Section 6 discusses one-dimensional downwards transient diffusions. While the infinite time-horizon case is treated in both Section 5 and Section 6, Section 7 contains results for Brownian motion with drift over finite time-intervals.

General probabilistic remarks. The underlying filtration $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ is assumed to be right-continuous, but it will *not* be assumed that each $\mathcal{F}_t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, is completed with $\mathbb{P}$-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$.

Although this relaxation calls for some technicalities, it is essential in the development; indeed, the need for defining a probability on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ that is not absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ (not even locally, on each $\mathcal{F}_t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$) will arise. An extensive part of the general theory of stochastic processes can be developed without the completeness assumption on filtrations, as long as properties that hold "everywhere" are asked to hold in an "almost everywhere" sense. (Of course, there are exceptions to the previous rule; for example, the so-called debut theorem fails if the filtration is not completed — see the discussion in [28, II.75].) The interested reader can refer to [16, Chapter I and Chapter II] for results in this slightly non-conventional framework that shall be used throughout the paper. Versions of the section theorem from [14, IV§1], where again the filtration is not assumed to be completed, will also be useful.

For a càdlàg process X, define the process $X_- = (X_{t-})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$, where X_{t-} is the left-limit of X at $t \in (0, \infty)$; by convention, $X_{0-} = 0$. Also, $\Delta X := X - X_-$. Every predictable process H is supposed to satisfy $H_0 = 0$. For any $[0, \infty]$-valued, $\mathcal{F}$-measurable random variable ρ and any process X, $X^\rho = X_{\rho \wedge \cdot}$ is defined as usual to be the process X stopped at ρ. For any càdlàg process X, we set $X^\uparrow := \sup_{t \in [0, \cdot]} X_t$, as well as $X^* = \sup_{t \in [0, \cdot]} |X_t| = (|X|)^\uparrow$.

Whenever H and X are processes such that X is a semimartingale to be used as an integrator and H can be used as integrand with respect to X, we use $\int_{[0, \cdot]} H_t \mathrm{d} X_t$ to denote the integral process. For a detailed account of stochastic integration, see [16].

If not stated otherwise, a property of a stochastic process (such as nonnegativity, path right-continuity, etc.) is assumed to hold *everywhere*; we make explicit note if these properties hold almost surely with respect to some probability on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. When processes that are (local) martingales, supermartingales, etc., are considered, it is tacitly assumed that their paths are almost surely càdlàg with respect to the probability under consideration; for example local martingales on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ have $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. càdlàg paths.

In this paper, we *always* work under the following:

Standing Assumption 0.1. All random times ρ are assumed to satisfy $\mathbb{P}[\rho < \infty] = 1$.

The reason for above assumption is purely conventional; under its force, $t = \infty$ does not appear explicitly in the time-indices involved, something that would be unusual and create unnecessary confusion. We stress, however, that Assumption 0.1 in practice does not entail any loss of generality whatsoever. Indeed, a simple deterministic time-change of $[0, \infty]$ to $[0, 1]$ on the time-indices of filtrations, processes, etc., makes any $[0, \infty]$-valued random time actually bounded; then, all the results of the paper apply.

1. A Canonical Pair Associated with a Random Time

We keep all notation and remarks that appeared in the introductory section. In particular, Assumption 0.1 will always be tacitly in force.

1.1. Construction of the canonical pair.

The following result is the point of our departure.

Theorem 1.1. *Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Then, there exists a pair of processes (K, L) with the following properties:*

1. *K is $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, right-continuous, nondecreasing, with $0 \leq K \leq 1$.*
2. *L is a nonnegative process with $L_0 = 1$ that is a local martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$.*
3. *For any nonnegative optional processes V on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$, it holds that*
$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[V_\rho] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} V_t \, L_t \mathrm{d}K_t\right].$$
4. *$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{I}_{\{K_{t-}=1\}} \mathrm{d}L_t = 0$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{I}_{\{L_t=0\}} \mathrm{d}K_t = 0$ hold $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.*

Furthermore, a pair (L, K) that satisfies the above requirements is essentially unique, in the following sense: if (K', L') is another pair that satisfies the above requirements, then K is $\mathbb{P}$-indistinguishable from K', while $\mathbb{P}[L_t = L'_t, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid K_\infty > 0] = 1$.

Definition 1.2. For a random time ρ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$, the pair (K, L) that satisfies requirements (1), (2), (3) and (4) of Theorem 1.1 will be called *the canonical pair associated with ρ*.

Remark 1.3. Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with associated pair (K, L). Then, ρ is a stopping time on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$ if and only if $K = \mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho,\infty[\![}$ (and, in this case, $L \equiv 1$ will hold). Indeed, if ρ is a stopping time, $K' := \mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho,\infty[\![}$ is $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, nonnegative and nondecreasing, and $0 \leq K' \leq 1$ holds. Furthermore, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[V_\rho] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} V_t \mathrm{d}K'_t]$ holds for all nonnegative and optional V on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$. By the essential uniqueness under $\mathbb{P}$ of the canonical pair associated with ρ, we obtain $K = \mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho,\infty[\![}$ (and $L = 1$). Conversely, assume that $K = \mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho,\infty[\![}$; as K is $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, ρ is a stopping time.

Given a random time ρ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$, it will now be explained how the associated canonical pair (K, L) is constructed. We follow the proof of [20, Theorem 2.1], which contains Theorem 1.1 as a special case. Only details which will be essential in the present development are provided. We also introduce some further notation to be used throughout.

Let Z be the nonnegative càdlàg supermartingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ that satisfies $Z_t = \mathbb{P}[\rho > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. (The fact that such a $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. càdlàg version Z exists follows from the right-continuity of the filtration $\mathbf{F}$ and the right-continuity of the function $\mathbb{R}_+ \ni t \mapsto \mathbb{P}[\rho > t] \in [0, 1]$ by an application of [14, Theorem II.2.44].) In view of Assumption 0.1, $Z_\infty := \lim_{t\to\infty} Z_t$ is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. equal to zero. Note that Z is the conditional survival process associated to a random time by Azéma — see [18] and the references therein. Also, let A be the dual optional projection of $\mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho,\infty[\![}$ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$; in other words, A is the unique (up to $\mathbb{P}$-evanescence) $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, càdlàg, nonnegative and nondecreasing process such that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[V_\rho] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} V_t \mathrm{d}A_t\right]$ holds for all nonnegative optional process V on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$. Then, $N := Z + A$ is a nonnegative martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $N_t = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[A_\infty \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$, for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$.

Remark 1.4. Since we do not assume that the $\mathcal{F}_0$ contains all $\mathbb{P}$-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$, the properties of A being càdlàg, nondecreasing and nonnegative only are valid for $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. every path. However, one can alter A to have them holding identically. Indeed, with $\mathbb{D}$ denoting a countable and dense subset of $\mathbb{R}_+$, define

$$A' := \lim_{\mathbb{D} \ni t \downarrow \cdot} \left(\sup_{s \in [0,t] \cap \mathbb{D}} (\max \{A_s, 0\}) \right).$$

It is easily seen that this new process A' is $\mathbf{F}$-adapted (the right-continuity of $\mathbf{F}$ is essential here), càdlàg, nondecreasing and nonnegative, and that $A = A'$ up to $\mathbb{P}$-evanescence. It is possible that A can explode to $+\infty$ in finite time, but this happens on a set of zero (outer) $\mathbb{P}$-measure and will not affect the results that follow in any way. Therefore, we might, and shall, assume in the sequel that A is càdlàg, nondecreasing and nonnegative everywhere.

Remark 1.5. The expected total mass of A over $\mathbb{R}_+$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[A_\infty] = 1$. If $\mathbb{P}[A_\infty > 1] = 0$, in which case $\mathbb{P}[A_\infty = 1] = 1$, defining $K := A$ (more precisely, $K := \min\{A, 1\}$) and $L := 1$ would suffice for the purposes of Theorem 1.1. However, in all other cases of random times we have $\mathbb{P}[A_\infty > 1] > 0$, and the pair (K, L) is constructed from (A, Z) as will be shown below.

We continue with providing the definition of the pair (K, L). Consider the stopping time $\zeta_0 := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid Z_{t-} = 0 \text{ or } Z_t = 0\}$; in fact, ζ_0 actually is the terminal time of movement for both Z and A. The process K is defined via

$$K = 1 - \mathbb{P}[\rho > 0] \exp\left(- \int_{(0, \zeta_0 \wedge \cdot]} \frac{\mathrm{d}A_t}{Z_t + \Delta A_t} \right) \prod_{t \in (0, \zeta_0 \wedge \cdot]} \left(\left(1 - \frac{\Delta A_t}{Z_t + \Delta A_t} \right) \exp\left(\frac{\Delta A_t}{Z_t + \Delta A_t} \right) \right), \tag{1.1}$$

where by convention the product of an empty set of numbers is equal to one. It is clear that K is $\mathbf{F}$-adapted, càdlàg, nondecreasing and $[0, 1]$-valued on $[\![0, \zeta_0[\![$. A little care has to be exercised in the value of K at ζ_0. On $\{\Delta A_{\zeta_0} = 0\}$, it simply holds that $K_{\zeta_0} = K_{\zeta_0 -}$. On $\{\Delta A_{\zeta_0} > 0\}$ it holds that $K_{\zeta_0} = 1$ because the product term on the right-hand-side of equation (1.1) is zero. The process K remains constant after ζ_0. In order to get some intuition on the definition of K, note that the differential equation that the process K defined in (1.1) satisfies is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}K_t}{1 - K_{t-}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}A_t}{Z_t + \Delta A_t}, \qquad \text{for } t \in [0, \zeta_0). \tag{1.2}$$

For fixed $t \in [0, \zeta_0)$, $Z_t + \Delta A_t = \mathbb{P}[\rho \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ represents the expected total remaining "life" of ρ on $[t, \infty]$, conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_t$; then, formally, $\mathrm{d}A_t / (Z_t + \Delta A_t)$ is the "fraction of remaining life of ρ spent at t." The equivalent "fraction of remaining life spent at t" for K would be $\mathrm{d}K_t / (1 - K_{t-})$. (The previous quantity is based on the understanding that $\mathbb{P}[K_\infty = 1] = 1$, although this is not always the case as will be shown later in Remark 4.5.) To get a feeling of how L should be defined, observe that $(Z + \Delta A) \Delta K = (1 - K_-) \Delta A$ implies that $(Z + \Delta A)(1 - K) = (1 - K_-) Z$. Therefore, from (1.2) we obtain that $\mathrm{d}K_t / (1 - K_t) = \mathrm{d}A_t / Z_t$ holds for $t \in [0, \zeta_0)$, which implies that $Z_t \mathrm{d}K_t = (1 - K_t)\mathrm{d}A_t$ holds for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since $\mathrm{d}A_t = L_t \mathrm{d}K_t$ has to hold for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ in view of property (3) in Theorem 1.1, we obtain $L(1 - K) = Z$. Using the previous equality and Itô's formula we obtain the dynamics

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t}{L_{t-}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}N_t}{Z_{t-}}, \quad t \in [0, \zeta_0], \tag{1.3}$$

where recall that $N = Z + A$. Equation (1.3) can actually be used as the definition of L, which becomes equal to the stochastic logarithm of the local martingale $\int_0^{\zeta_0 \wedge \cdot} (1/Z_{t-})\mathrm{d}N_t$. (One has to be quite careful here: the latter process might not be defined at time ζ_0 and onwards due to explosion, which will imply that $L_t = 0$ for all $t \geq \zeta_0$. The treatment in [20, §2.3] makes sure that all such issues are dealt with.) Then, the relationship $Z = L(1 - K)$ can be shown to hold true. One can check [20, §2.3] for all the remaining technical details of the proof.

Remark 1.6. When ΔK is $\mathbb{P}$-evanescent (which happens exactly when ΔA is $\mathbb{P}$-evanescent), the formula $Z = L(1-K)$ implies that L coincides with the local martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ that appears in the multiplicative decomposition of the nonnegative $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$-supermartingale Z. This fact provides the most efficient way to calculate the canonical pair associated with a random time that avoids all stopping times. (For the definition and characterization of random times avoiding all stopping times see Subsection 2.1.)

1.2. **A consistent family of probabilities associated with a random time.**

Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with associated canonical pair (K, L). For $u \in [0, 1)$, let

$$\eta_u := \inf \{ t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid K_t \geq u \},$$

with the usual convention $\eta_u = \infty$ if the last set is empty. The nondecreasing family $(\eta_u)_{u \in [0,1)}$ of stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$ will play a major role in the development. We start with a "localization" result.

Lemma 1.7. *Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with canonical pair (K, L). For $u \in [0, 1)$, $\mathbb{P}\left[L^*_{\eta_u} \leq 2/(1-u)\right] = 1$ holds. If $\mathbb{P}[\eta_u < \infty,\, \Delta L_{\eta_u} > 0] = 0$, then $\mathbb{P}\left[L^*_{\eta_u} \leq 1/(1-u)\right] = 1$.*

Proof. Fix $u \in [0, 1)$. Since $K_{t-} \leq u$ holds for $t \in [0, \eta_u]$ and $Z_- \leq 1$ holds up to $\mathbb{P}$-evanescence, it follows that

$$L_- = \frac{Z_-}{1 - K_-} \leq \frac{1}{1-u} \text{ holds } \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s. on } [\![0, \eta_u]\!],$$

which implies that $\mathbb{P}\left[L^*_{\eta_u -} \leq 1/(1-u)\right] = 1$. It remains to check what happens at η_u. In case $\mathbb{P}[\eta_u < \infty,\, \Delta L_{\eta_u} > 0] = 0$, $\mathbb{P}\left[L^*_{\eta_u} \leq 1/(1-u)\right] = 1$ is immediate. Now, remove the assumption $\mathbb{P}[\eta_u < \infty,\, \Delta L_{\eta_u} > 0] = 0$. We shall use that $\Delta A \leq 1$ up to $\mathbb{P}$-evanescence. (Indeed, the equality $\Delta A_\tau = \mathbb{P}[\rho = \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau]$ holds $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. on $\{\tau < \infty\}$ for any stopping time τ, since A is the dual optional projection of $\mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho,\infty[\![}$ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. It follows that $\mathbb{P}[\Delta A_\tau \leq 1] = 1$ for any stopping time τ and, therefore, that $\Delta A \leq 1$ up to $\mathbb{P}$-evanescence by [14, Theorem 4.10].) Using (1.3), we obtain, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$L_{\eta_u} = L_{\eta_u -} + \frac{\Delta N_{\eta_u}}{1 - K_{\eta_u -}} = \frac{Z_{\eta_u -} + \Delta N_{\eta_u}}{1 - K_{\eta_u -}} = \frac{Z_{\eta_u} + \Delta A_{\eta_u}}{1 - K_{\eta_u -}} \leq \frac{2}{1-u},$$

which completes the proof. □

In view of Lemma 1.7, for any $u \in [0,1)$ one can construct a probability measure $\mathbb{Q}_u$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ via the recipe $\mathrm{d}\mathbb{Q}_u = L_{\eta_u} \mathrm{d}\mathbb{P}$. The collection $(\mathbb{Q}_u)_{u \in [0,1)}$ has the following consistency property: $\mathbb{Q}_u = \mathbb{Q}_v$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_{\eta_u})$ holds whenever $0 \leq u \leq v < 1$. It would be very convenient (but not *a priori* clear and certainly not true in general, as is demonstrated in Example 6.4) if one could find a probability $\mathbb{Q} \equiv \mathbb{Q}_1$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}} = \mathbb{Q}_u|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}}$ holds for all $u \in [0,1)$. This is indeed the case in many examples, as will be discussed later. The consequences of such existence are analyzed in Section 3. For the time being, we mention an auxiliary result.

Lemma 1.8. *For all $u \in [0,1)$, it holds that $\mathbb{Q}_u[L_{\eta_u} > 0] = 1$ and $\mathbb{Q}_u[\eta_u < \infty] = 1$.*

Proof. Fix $u \in [0,1)$. Then, $\mathbb{Q}_u[L_{\eta_u} > 0] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{L_{\eta_u} > 0\}}] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_{\eta_u}] = 1$. In order to show the equality $\mathbb{Q}_u[\eta_u < \infty] = 1$, first observe that since $0 = Z_\infty = L_\infty(1 - K_\infty)$ holds $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., we have $\mathbb{P}[K_\infty < 1, L_\infty > 0] = 0$. Coupled with the fact that $\{\eta_u = \infty\} \subseteq \{K_\infty < 1\}$, we obtain $\mathbb{P}\left[L_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{\eta_u < \infty\}} = L_{\eta_u}\right] = 1$. Therefore, $\mathbb{Q}_u[\eta_u < \infty] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[L_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{\eta_u < \infty\}}\right] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_{\eta_u}] = 1$. □

1.3. **Time changes.** For a nonnegative $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$-optional process V, the change-of-variables formula gives $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} V_t \mathrm{d}K_t = \int_{[0,1)} V_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{\eta_u < \infty\}} \mathrm{d}K_{\eta_u}$. For $a \in [0,1)$, on the event $\{K_{\eta_a -} < K_{\eta_a}\}$ it holds that

$$V_{\eta_a} \Delta K_{\eta_a} = V_{\eta_a}(K_{\eta_a} - K_{\eta_a -}) = \int_{K_{\eta_a -}}^{K_{\eta_a}} V_{\eta_a} \mathrm{d}u = \int_{K_{\eta_a -}}^{K_{\eta_a}} V_{\eta_u} \mathrm{d}u.$$

Therefore, $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} V_t \mathrm{d}K_t = \int_{[0,1)} V_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{\eta_u < \infty\}} \mathrm{d}u$ follows. The last fact helps to establish the following result.

Proposition 1.9. *Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Then, for any nonnegative $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$-optional process V, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[V_\rho] = \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}[V_{\eta_u}] \mathrm{d}u = \lim_{a \uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\left[\int_{[0,a]} V_{\eta_u} \mathrm{d}u\right]. \tag{1.4}$$

Proof. As discussed above, for any V that is nonnegative and $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$-optional, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} V_t L_t \mathrm{d}K_t = \int_{[0,1)} V_{\eta_u} L_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{\eta_u < \infty\}} \mathrm{d}u.$$

Therefore, the first equality in (1.4) is immediate from Fubini's theorem, the definition of the probabilities $(\mathbb{Q}_u)_{u \in [0,1)}$ and Lemma 1.8. The second equality in (1.4) follows from the monotone convergence theorem and the consistency of the family $(\mathbb{Q}_u)_{u \in [0,1)}$. □

Proposition 1.9 has a simple corollary, which states that the law of $K_{\rho-}$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is stochastically dominated (in first order) by the standard uniform law, and that the latter standard uniform law is stochastically dominated by the law of K_ρ under $\mathbb{P}$.

Proposition 1.10. *Let ρ be any random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with associated pair (K, L). Then, for all nondecreasing functions $f : [0,1) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, it holds that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[f(K_{\rho-})] \leq \int_{[0,1)} f(u)\mathrm{d}u \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[f(K_\rho)]. \tag{1.5}$$

Proof. Pick any nondecreasing function $f : [0,1) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. For establishing the inequalities (1.5), it is clearly sufficient to deal with the case where $f(u) \in \mathbb{R}_+$ for $u \in [0,1)$. Since $K_{\eta_u-} \leq u$ and f is nondecreasing, (1.4) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[f(K_{\rho-})] = \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}\left[f(K_{\eta_u-})\right]\mathrm{d}u \leq \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}\left[f(u)\right]\mathrm{d}u = \int_{[0,1)} f(u)\mathrm{d}u.$$

The other inequality in (1.5) is proved similarly, using the fact that $\mathbb{Q}_u\left[K_{\eta_u} \geq u\right] = 1$ for $u \in [0,1)$, as follows from Lemma 1.8. □

2. Further Properties of the Canonical Representation Pair

2.1. **Random times that avoid all stopping times.** A random time ρ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is said to *avoid all stopping times on* $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ if $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \tau] = 0$ holds whenever τ is a stopping time on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$. The next result states equivalent conditions to ρ avoiding all stopping times.

Proposition 2.1. *Let ρ be any random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with associated canonical pair (K, L). Then, the following statements are equivalent:*

1. *ρ avoids all stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$.*
2. *ΔK is $\mathbb{P}$-evanescent.*
3. *$\mathbb{P}[\Delta K_\rho = 0] = 1$.*
4. *K_ρ has the standard uniform distribution under $\mathbb{P}$.*

Proof. In the course of the proof, we shall be using A, Z, and N for the processes that were introduced in Subsection 1.1, associated to the random time ρ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$.

For implication (1) ⇒ (2), the fact that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[\Delta A_\tau] = \mathbb{P}[\rho = \tau] = 0$ implies that $\mathbb{P}[\Delta A_\tau = 0] = 1$ holds for all stopping times τ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$. Then, in view of (1.2), $\mathbb{P}[\Delta K_\tau = 0] = 1$ holds for all stopping times τ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$ as well. An application of [14, Theorem 4.10] shows that ΔK is $\mathbb{P}$-evanescent. Implication (2) ⇒ (3) is trivial. Now, assume (3); from the inequalities (1.5) we get $\mathbb{E}[f(K_\rho)] = \int_{[0,1)} f(u)\mathrm{d}u$ for any nondecreasing Borel function $f : [0,1) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, which implies that K_ρ has a standard uniform distribution under $\mathbb{P}$. In the next three paragraphs, we shall show (4) ⇒ (3) ⇒ (2) ⇒ (1).

We show (4) ⇒ (3). By (1.4), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[K_\rho + K_{\rho-}\right] = \lim_{a\uparrow 1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_a}\left[\int_{[0,a]} \left(K_{\eta_u} + K_{\eta_u-}\right) \mathrm{d}u\right].$$

For $a \in [0,1)$, on the event $\{K_{\eta_a} \geq a\}$ it holds that

$$a^2 = \int_{[0,a]} 2u\mathrm{d}u \leq \int_{[0,a]} \left(K_{\eta_u} + K_{\eta_u-}\right) \mathrm{d}u \leq 1.$$

With the help of Lemma 1.8, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[K_\rho + K_{\rho-}\right] = 1$. Since $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[K_\rho\right] = 1/2$ holds in view of the fact that K_ρ has the standard uniform distribution under $\mathbb{P}$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[K_{\rho-}] = 1/2$. As K is nondecreasing and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\Delta K_\rho\right] = 0$, we obtain $\mathbb{P}[\Delta K_\rho = 0] = 1$, i.e., statement (3).

For (3) ⇒ (2), start with the following observation: for any stopping time τ, on $\{\tau < \infty\}$ it holds that

$$L_\tau = L_{\tau-} + \Delta L_\tau = L_{\tau-} + \frac{\Delta N_\tau}{1 - K_{\tau-}} = \frac{L_{\tau-}(1 - K_{\tau-}) + Z_\tau - Z_{\tau-} + \Delta A_\tau}{1 - K_{\tau-}} = \frac{Z_\tau + \Delta A_\tau}{1 - K_{\tau-}}.$$

Since $\{\Delta K_\tau > 0\} \subseteq \{\Delta A_\tau > 0\}$ holds on $\{\tau < \infty\}$, it follows that $\{\Delta K_\tau > 0\} \subseteq \{L_\tau > 0\}$ modulo $\mathbb{P}$ holds on $\{\tau < \infty\}$ for all stopping times τ. Continuing, note that

$$0 = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\Delta K_\rho\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \left(K_t - K_{t-}\right) L_t \mathrm{d}K_t\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\sum_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} L_t (\Delta K_t)^2\right].$$

Consider a sequence $(\tau_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of stopping times with disjoint graphs that exhausts the jumps of K; then, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L_{\tau_n}(\Delta K_{\tau_n})^2\right] = 0$. This means that $\sum_{n\in\mathbb{N}} L_{\tau_n}(\Delta K_{\tau_n})^2 = 0$, $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.; since $\{\Delta K_{\tau_n} > 0\} \subseteq \{L_{\tau_n} > 0\}$ modulo $\mathbb{P}$ holds on $\{\tau_n < \infty\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain $\mathbb{P}\left[\Delta K_{\tau_n} = 0\right] = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The last implies that $\mathbb{P}[\Delta K_\tau = 0] = 1$ for all stopping times τ. In view of [14, Theorem 4.10], this is exactly statement (2).

Finally, we establish (2) ⇒ (1). Since

$$\{\Delta A_\tau > 0\} = \{L_\tau \Delta K_\tau > 0\} = \{L_\tau > 0\} \cap \{\Delta K_\tau > 0\} = \{\Delta K_\tau > 0\}$$

modulo $\mathbb{P}$ holds for all stopping times τ, we have $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \tau] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[\Delta A_\tau] = 0$. the latter being valid because $\mathbb{P}[\Delta A_\tau > 0] = \mathbb{P}[\Delta K_\tau > 0] = 0$. Therefore, ρ avoids all stopping times under $\mathbb{P}$. □

2.2. **An optimality property of L amongst all nonnegative local $\mathbb{P}$-martingales.**

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all nonnegative supermartingales S on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{P}[S_0 = 1] = 1$. The set $\mathcal{S}$ contains in particular all nonnegative local martingales M on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{P}[M_0 = 1] = 1$. For a random time ρ with associated canonical pair (K, L), it is reasonable to expect that the local martingale L has some optimality property within the class $\mathcal{S}$ when sampled at ρ. Indeed, the next result shows that, in the jargon of [20], L_ρ is the numéraire under $\mathbb{P}$ in the convex set $\{S_\rho \mid S \in \mathcal{S}\}$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with associated canonical pair (K, L). Then, $\mathbb{P}[L_\rho > 0] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[S_\rho / L_\rho\right] \leq 1$ holds for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$. If, furthermore, ρ avoids all stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$, then the stronger inequality $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[S_\rho / L_\rho \mid K_\rho\right] \leq 1$ holds for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 1.8, $\mathbb{Q}_u\left[L_{\eta_u} > 0\right] = 1$ holds for all $u \in [0, 1)$. Then, by Proposition 1.9,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[L_\rho > 0\right] = \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{Q}_u\left[L_{\eta_u} > 0\right] \mathrm{d}u = 1.$$

Fix $S \in \mathcal{S}$. Observe that $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}[S_{\eta_u}/L_{\eta_u}] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[S_{\eta_u} \mathbb{I}_{\{L_{\eta_u} > 0\}}] \leq 1$ holds for all $u \in [0, 1)$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[S_\rho / L_\rho] = \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}\left[S_{\eta_u}/L_{\eta_u}\right] \mathrm{d}u \leq 1.$$

Assume now that ρ avoids all stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. By a straightforward extension of Lemma 1.8, $\mathbb{Q}_u\left[K_{\eta_u} = u\right] = 1$ holds for all $u \in [0, 1)$. Therefore, for all functions $f : [0, 1) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[(S_\rho / L_\rho)\, f(K_\rho)\right] &= \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}\left[(S_{\eta_u}/L_{\eta_u})\, f(K_{\eta_u})\right] \mathrm{d}u \\
&= \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}\left[(S_{\eta_u}/L_{\eta_u})\, f(u)\right] \mathrm{d}u \\
&\leq \int_{[0,1)} f(u) \mathrm{d}u \;=\; \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[f(K_\rho)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

the last equality following from Proposition 2.1. Since the function $f : [0, 1) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is arbitrary, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[S_\rho / L_\rho \mid K_\rho\right] \leq 1$. □

3. Random Times and Randomized Stopping Times

3.1. **The one probability $\mathbb{Q}$.** Recall the consistent family of probabilities $(\mathbb{Q}_u)_{u \in [0,1)}$ from Subsection 1.2. For the purposes of Section 3, we shall be working under the following assumption.

Assumption 3.1. There exists a probability measure $\mathbb{Q} \equiv \mathbb{Q}_1$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, as well as a random variable $U : \Omega \mapsto [0, 1)$, such that:

(1) $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}} = \mathbb{Q}_u|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}}$ holds for all $u \in [0, 1)$.
(2) Under both $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$, U is independent of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ and has the standard uniform law.

Remark 3.2. Given that there exists a probability measure $\mathbb{Q} \equiv \mathbb{Q}_1$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}} = \mathbb{Q}_u|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}}$ holds for all $u \in [0, 1)$, asking that there also exists a random variable $U : \Omega \mapsto [0, 1)$ such that U is independent of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$ and has the standard uniform law under both $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ entails no loss of generality whatsoever. Indeed, if such random variable does not exist, the underlying probability space can always be enlarged in order to support one. More precisely, define $\overline{\Omega} := \Omega \times [0, 1)$, a filtration $\overline{\mathbf{F}} = (\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ via $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \otimes \{\emptyset, [0, 1)\}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, as well as $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{B}([0, 1))$, where $\mathcal{B}([0, 1))$ is the Borel sigma-algebra on $[0, 1)$. It is immediate that $(\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ and $(\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ are in one-to-one correspondence. (However, $\mathcal{F}$ and $\overline{\mathcal{F}}$ are not isomorphic.) On $(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}})$, define $\overline{\mathbb{P}} := \mathbb{P} \otimes \mathsf{Leb}$,

$\overline{\mathbb{Q}} := \mathbb{Q} \otimes \mathsf{Leb}$, as well as $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_u := \mathbb{Q}_u \otimes \mathsf{Leb}$ for $u \in [0,1)$, where "Leb" denotes Lebesgue measure on $\mathcal{B}([0,1))$. Any process X on the original stochastic basis is identified on the new stochastic basis with the process $\overline{X}$ defined via $\overline{X}(\omega, u) = X(\omega)$ for all $(\omega, u) \in \overline{\Omega}$ — this way, properties like adaptedness and optionality of processes are in one-to-one correspondence. The random variable $U : \overline{\Omega} \mapsto [0,1)$ defined via $U(\omega, u) = u$ for all $(\omega, u) \in \overline{\Omega}$ has the standard uniform distribution, and is independent of $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_\infty$, the previous holding under both $\overline{\mathbb{P}}$ and $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Note that the pair associated with ρ on $(\overline{\Omega}, \overline{\mathcal{F}}, \overline{\mathbf{F}}, \overline{\mathbb{P}})$ is $(\overline{K}, \overline{L})$ in the previously-introduced notation, which is identified with (K, L). Furthermore, $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}|_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{\eta_u}} = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_u|_{\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{\eta_u}}$ holds for all $u \in [0,1)$.

Remark 3.3. Even though item (2) of Assumption 3.1 is not really an assumption in view of Remark 3.2 above, item (1) *is*, as Example 6.4 will reveal. In fact, Example 6.4 will make an additional point: even if $\mathbb{Q}$ exists, it is in general possible that neither of the conditions $\mathbb{Q} \ll_{\mathcal{F}_t} \mathbb{P}$ nor $\mathbb{P} \ll_{\mathcal{F}_t} \mathbb{Q}$ holds, for any choice of $t \in (0, \infty)$. This clarifies the absolute need to refrain from completing $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ with $\mathbb{P}$-null sets, even if the null sets come from $\bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathcal{F}_t$ and not from the much larger class $\bigvee_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathcal{F}_t$.

3.2. **The stochastic behavior of optional processes up to random times.** We now turn to the topic discussed in the introductory section: as long as distributional properties of optional processes on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$ up to a random time are concerned, one can pass from the original random time ρ and probability $\mathbb{P}$ to a randomized stopping time ψ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$, where $\mathbb{Q}$ is the probability of Assumption 3.1.

Theorem 3.4. *Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with associated canonical pair (K, L). Under the validity of Assumption 3.1, let $\mathbb{Q}$ the probability that appears there. Define*

$$\psi := \inf \{ t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid K_t \geq U \} = \eta_U.$$

Then, ψ is a randomized stopping time on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$ with associated canonical pair $(K, 1)$. Furthermore, for any optional process Y on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$, the finite-dimensional distributions of $Y^\rho = (Y_{\rho \wedge t})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ under $\mathbb{P}$ coincide with the finite-dimensional distributions of $Y^\psi = (Y_{\psi \wedge t})_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. Observe that $\{\psi > t\} = \{U > K_t\}$ holds for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{Q}[\psi > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \mathbb{Q}[U > K_t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = 1 - K_t, \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

It follows that the pair associated with ψ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$ is $(K, 1)$.

Pick any nonnegative optional process V on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[V_\rho] = \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_u}\left[V_{\eta_u}\right] \mathrm{d}u = \int_{[0,1)} \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}\left[V_{\eta_u}\right] \mathrm{d}u = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}\left[\int_{[0,1)} V_{\eta_u} \mathrm{d}u\right] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}\left[V_{\eta_U}\right] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}[V_\psi]. \tag{3.1}$$

Continuing, fix an optional process Y on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$ and times $\{t_1, \ldots, t_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$. For any nonnegative Borel-measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, the process $V = f(Y^{t_1}, \ldots, Y^{t_n})$ is optional on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$.

Since $V_\rho = f(Y_{\rho \wedge t_1}, \ldots, Y_{\rho \wedge t_n})$ and $V_\psi = f(Y_{\psi \wedge t_1}, \ldots, Y_{\psi \wedge t_n})$, (3.1) gives

$$\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[f(Y^\rho_{t_1}, \ldots, Y^\rho_{t_n})\right] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}\left[f(Y^\psi_{t_1}, \ldots, Y^\psi_{t_n})\right].$$

As the collection $\{t_1, \ldots, t_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}_+$ and the nonnegative Borel-measurable function f are arbitrary, the finite-dimensional distributions of Y^ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ coincide with the finite-dimensional distributions of Y^ψ under $\mathbb{Q}$. $\square$

4. First Examples

4.1. **Finite-horizon discrete-time models.** Models where the time-set is discrete can be naturally embedded in a continuous-time framework. *Only for the purposes of Subsection 4.1*, we consider a filtered probability space $(\Omega,\ \mathcal{F},\ \mathbf{F},\ \mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$, where $\mathbb{T} = \{0, \ldots, T\}$ for $T \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T \vee \sigma(U)$, where U is a random variable with uniform distribution under $\mathbb{P}$, independent of $\mathcal{F}_T$. A random time ρ in this setting is a $\mathbb{T}$-valued random variable.

It is straightforward to check that $A = \sum_{t \leq \cdot} \mathbb{P}[\rho = t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ is the dual optional projection on $(\Omega,\ \mathbf{F},\ \mathbb{P})$ of $\mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho, T]\!]}$. Recall from Subsection 1.1 the stopping time $\zeta_0 := \min\{t \in \mathbb{T} \mid Z_t = 0\}$. The discrete-time versions of (1.2) and (1.3) on $\{t \leq \zeta_0\}$ read

$$K_t = K_{t-1} + (1 - K_{t-1}) \left(\frac{A_t - A_{t-1}}{Z_t + A_t - A_{t-1}} \right) = K_{t-1} + (1 - K_{t-1}) \frac{\mathbb{P}[\rho = t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]}{\mathbb{P}[\rho \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]}$$

and

$$L_t = L_{t-1} \left(1 + \frac{N_t - N_{t-1}}{Z_{t-1}} \right) = L_{t-1} \frac{Z_t + A_t - A_{t-1}}{Z_{t-1}} = L_{t-1} \frac{\mathbb{P}[\rho \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_t]}{\mathbb{P}[\rho \geq t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}]}.$$

On $\{t > \zeta_0\}$, $K_t = K_{\zeta_0}$ and $L_t = L_{\zeta_0}$ holds.

In finite-horizon discrete-time settings like the one considered here, nonnegative local martingales are actually martingales — see [15]; therefore, one may define a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega,\ \mathcal{F})$ that has density L_T with respect to $\mathbb{P}$; then, $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}} = \mathbb{Q}_u|_{\mathcal{F}_{\eta_u}}$ holds for all $u \in [0, 1)$. The probability $\mathbb{Q}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}$. (Observe also that Assumption 3.1 is always valid in this setting. Indeed, L_T is $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable and, therefore, independent of U under $\mathbb{P}$, which implies that U is independent of $\mathcal{F}_T$ under $\mathbb{Q}$.) The next result shows that the stochastic behavior of ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ might be radically different.

Proposition 4.1. *Let ρ be a random time on $(\Omega,\ \mathbf{F},\ \mathbb{P})$. If $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}]$ is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\{0, 1\}$-valued, then $\mathbb{Q}[\rho = \zeta_0] = 1$.*

Proof. On $\{\zeta_0 > 0\}$ it holds that $L_{\zeta_0} = L_{\zeta_0 - 1} \mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] / \mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0 - 1}]$, which implies that $\{L_{\zeta_0} > 0\} = \{\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] > 0\}$. Since $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}]$ is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\{0, 1\}$-valued, it follows that $\{L_{\zeta_0} > 0\} = \{\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] = 1\}$ holds modulo $\mathbb{P}$ on $\{\zeta_0 > 0\}$. On $\{\zeta_0 = 0\}$ both $L_{\zeta_0} = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] = 1$ hold modulo $\mathbb{P}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{Q}[\rho = \zeta_0] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_{\zeta_0} \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho = \zeta_0\}}] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_{\zeta_0} \mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}]] = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_{\zeta_0}] = 1,$$

which completes the proof. □

Random times that satisfy the condition in the statement of Proposition 4.1 are $\mathbb{Q}$-a.s. equal to a stopping time. The next example shows that familiar random times that are far from being stopping times under $\mathbb{P}$ become $\mathbb{Q}$-a.s. equal to a constant.

Example 4.2. Let X be an adapted process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $\mathbb{P}[X_t \geq X_{t-1} \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] > 0$ holds $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. for all $t \in \mathbb{T} \setminus \{0\}$. Define $\rho := \max\{t \in \mathbb{T} \mid X_t = X^{\uparrow}_T\}$ to be the last time of maximum of X. On the event $\{\zeta_0 < T\}$, and in view of $\mathbb{P}[X_{\zeta_0+1} \geq X_{\zeta_0} \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] > 0$ holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., we have $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] = 0$ holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. On the other hand, on the event $\{\zeta_0 = T\}$ we have $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 \mid \mathcal{F}_{\zeta_0}] = \mathbb{I}_{\{\rho = T\}}$, which is $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. $\{0, 1\}$-valued. From statement (2) of Proposition 4.1, it follows that $\mathbb{Q}[\rho = \zeta_0] = 1$. Since $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \zeta_0 < T] = 0$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, we obtain $\mathbb{Q}[\rho = T] = 1$.

A continuous-time version of Example 4.2 involving Brownian motion with drift over finite time-intervals will be given in Subsection 7.2, where it will be demonstrated in particular that the corresponding probabilities $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ become singular.

4.2. **Time of maximum of nonnegative local martingales with continuous maximum, vanishing at infinity.**

For special cases of random times, the calculation of the canonical pair becomes relatively easy.

Proposition 4.3. *Let M be a nonnegative local martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $M_0 = 1$, $M^* = M^{\uparrow}$ having continuous paths and $\lim_{t \to \infty} M_t = 0$, all holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. Let ρ be any time of maximum of M, in the sense that $\mathbb{P}[M_\rho = M^*_\infty] = 1$. Also, let $\rho_{\max} := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid M_t = M^*_\infty\}$, where the supremum of an empty set is by convention equal to ∞. Then, the following are true:*

- *The canonical pair (K, L) associated with ρ is such that $K := 1 - 1/M^*$ and $L = M$.*
- *ρ avoids all stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$.*
- *$\mathbb{P}[\rho = \rho_{\max}] = 1$.*

Proof. The key to proving that ρ avoids all stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and that the pair associated with ρ is $(1 - 1/M^*, M)$ is to note that $Z = M/M^*$ and $A = \log(M^*)$, which can be done by direct calculation (see [24], as well as [20, Theorem 2.14]); then, one can use Remark 1.6 to conclude.

Note that $\rho_{\max}$ is a special instance of a random time that achieves the maximum of M; in fact, $\mathbb{P}[M_{\rho_{\max}} = M^*_\infty] = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}[\rho \leq \rho_{\max}] = 1$. It follows that the pair associated with $\rho_{\max}$ is also $(1 - 1/M^*, M)$. Since the canonical pair associated to a random time completely determines its distribution, the laws of ρ and $\rho_{\max}$ are the same under $\mathbb{P}$. Combined with $\mathbb{P}[\rho \leq \rho_{\max}] = 1$, we obtain $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \rho_{\max}] = 1$. □

Remark 4.4. Proposition 4.3 implies in particular that there exists an almost surely unique time of maximum of a nonnegative local martingale with continuous maximum, vanishing at infinity.

Remark 4.5. It was already hinted out in the discussion at Subsection 1.1 that the canonical pair (K, L) associated with a random time may be such that $\mathbb{P}\left[K_\infty < 1\right] > 0$ holds and L fails to be a true martingale. Indeed, in the context of Proposition 4.3, $M = L$ can be freely chosen to be a strict local martingale in the terminology of [10]; furthermore, $\mathbb{P}\left[K_\infty < 1\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[L^*_\infty < \infty\right] = 1$.

Remark 4.6. Recall the set $\mathcal{S}$ from Subsection 2.2. Specializing to the setting of Proposition 4.3, let ρ be the time of maximum of a nonnegative local martingale M on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $M_0 = 1$, M^* having continuous paths and $\lim_{t \to \infty} M_t = 0$, all holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. In this case, and since $K_\rho = 1 - 1/M_\rho$, we obtain from Proposition 2.2 that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[S_\rho \mid M_\rho] \leq M_\rho$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$. This result is quite interesting — it states that *no matter* what the level of M at its maximum, no other nonnegative supermartingale with unit initial value is expected to lie above that.

Since $\mathcal{S}$ is convex, the condition $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[S_\rho \mid M_\rho] \leq M_\rho$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$ is actually equivalent to the fact that M_ρ stochastically dominates all random variables in $\{S_\rho \mid S \in \mathcal{S}\}$ in second order, meaning that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[U(S_\rho)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[U(M_\rho)\right]$ holds for all nondecreasing concave functions $U : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. In fact, a stronger statement is true. Since S is a nonnegative supermartingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $\mathbb{P}[S_0 = 1] = 1$ for all $S \in \mathcal{S}$, Doob's maximal inequality implies that $\mathbb{P}\left[S_\rho > x\right] \leq 1 \wedge (1/x)$ holds for all $x \in (0, \infty)$. On the other hand, since M is a nonnegative local martingale $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $M_0 = 1$, M^* having continuous paths and $\lim_{t \to \infty} M_t = 0$, all holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., it follows that $\mathbb{P}\left[M_\rho > x\right] = 1 \wedge (1/x)$ holds for all $x \in (0, \infty)$. Therefore, $\sup_{S \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}\left[S_\rho > x\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[M_\rho > x\right]$ holds for all $x \in (0, \infty)$, which implies that M_ρ stochastically dominates all random variables in $\{S_\rho \mid S \in \mathcal{S}\}$ even in first order.

4.3. **Last-exit times of nonnegative local martingales with continuous maximum, vanishing at infinity.** As in Subsection 4.2, let M be a nonnegative local martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $M_0 = 1$, $M^* = M^\uparrow$ having continuous paths and $\lim_{t \to \infty} M_t = 0$, all holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. We fix $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and define $\rho := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid M_t > y\}$, setting $\rho = 0$ when the last set is empty. In words, ρ is the last exit time of M from the open set (y, ∞). In this case, it is straightforward that

$$Z_t = \mathbb{P}[\rho > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = \frac{M_t}{y} \wedge 1, \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{R}_+.$$

(The set-inclusion $\{M > y\} \subseteq \{Z = 1\}$ certainly holds modulo $\mathbb{P}$; the fact that $Z = M/y$ holds on $\{M \leq y\}$ follows from Doob's maximal equality because M^* has $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. continuous paths — see for example [24]).

Recall from Subsection 1.1 that $Z = N - A$ holds for an appropriate local martingale N on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. In order to compute N and A in the decomposition of Z, information on the jumps of A is required. Since A is the dual optional projection of $\mathbb{I}_{[\![\rho, \infty[\![}$ on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$, $\Delta A_\tau = \mathbb{P}\left[\rho = \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau\right]$ holds for any finite stopping time τ. It is clear that $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau]$ is equal to zero on $\{M_\tau > y\} \bigcup \{M_{\tau-} \leq y\}$. Furthermore, $\mathbb{P}\left[\rho \geq \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau\right] = 1$ holds on $\{M_{\tau-} > y,\, M_\tau \leq y\}$, which gives $\mathbb{P}[\rho = \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau] = 1 - \mathbb{P}[\rho > \tau \mid \mathcal{F}_\tau] = 1 - Z_\tau = 1 - M_\tau/y$. We conclude that

$\Delta A = (1 - M/y)\mathbb{I}_{\{M_- > y,\, M \le y\}}$. Now, by the Meyer-Itô formula [27, Theorem IV.70], it holds that

$$\mathrm{d}Z_t = \frac{\mathrm{d}(M_t \wedge y)}{y} = \left(\frac{\mathbb{I}_{\{M_{t-} \le y\}}}{y} \right) \mathrm{d}M_t - B_t, \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{4.1}$$

where B is a non-decreasing process, and we force $B_0 = A_0 = \mathbb{P}[\rho = 0] = 1 - Z_0$. In fact, the continuous part of B (when seen as a non-decreasing process) coincides with $(1/2y)\Lambda^M(y)$, where $(\Lambda^M_t(y))_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ denotes the semimartingale local time of M at level y — see [27, page 216].

Continuing, note that $\Delta Z = (M/y - 1)\mathbb{I}_{\{M_- > y,\, M \le y\}} + (\Delta M / y)\mathbb{I}_{\{M_- \le y\}}$, which by (4.1) gives that $\Delta B = (1 - M/y)\mathbb{I}_{\{M_- > y,\, M \le y\}} = \Delta A$. It is then immediate that $A = B$ should hold, which also implies that N satisfies dynamics $\mathrm{d}N_t = \left(\mathbb{I}_{\{M_{t-} \le y\}}/y\right)\mathrm{d}M_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Since $\mathbb{P}\left[\rho > 0\right] = 1 \wedge (1/y)$, $\{M = y\} \subseteq \{Z = 1\}$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \mathbb{I}_{\{M_t \neq y\}} \mathrm{d}\Lambda^M_t(y) = 0$ holds $\mathbb{P}$-a.s. in view of [27, Chapter IV, Theorem 69, page 217], some algebra on (1.1) gives

$$K = 1 - \left(1 \wedge \frac{1}{y}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2y}\Lambda^M(y)\right) \prod_{t \in [0,\cdot]} \left(\frac{M_t}{y} \mathbb{I}_{\{M_{t-} > y,\, M_t \le y\}} \right). \tag{4.2}$$

Furthermore, since $\{M_- \le y\} \subseteq \{yZ_- = M_-\}$, the dynamics $\mathrm{d}N_t = \left(\mathbb{I}_{\{M_{t-} \le y\}}/y\right)\mathrm{d}M_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and (1.3) give

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t}{L_{t-}} = \mathbb{I}_{\{M_{t-} \le y\}} \frac{\mathrm{d}M_t}{M_{t-}}, \ \text{ for } t \in [0, \zeta_0]. \tag{4.3}$$

Remark 4.7. If Assumption 3.1 is valid, the dynamics in (4.3) suggest that the stochastic behavior of processes under $\mathbb{Q}$ is like the one under $\mathbb{P}$ when $M_- > y$; furthermore, when $M_- \le y$, the stochastic behavior of processes under $\mathbb{Q}$ is like the one under the corresponding probability $\mathbb{Q}$ when the random time is the time of maximum of M, studied in Subsection 4.2. These heuristic observations will become more rigorous in the setting of last-exit times for one-dimensional downwards transient diffusions described in Section 6.

Remark 4.8. Suppose that M actually has $\mathbb{P}$-a.s continuous paths and that $y \in (0, 1]$. In this case, $K = 1 - \exp\left(-(1/2y)\Lambda^M(y)\right)$, so that $\Delta K = 0$ up to a $\mathbb{P}$-evanescent set. By Proposition 2.1, $K_\rho = K_\infty$ has the standard uniform distribution under $\mathbb{P}$. It follows that $\Lambda^M_\rho(y) = \Lambda^M_\infty(y)$ has the exponential distribution with rate parameter $2y$ under $\mathbb{P}$. Also, note that in this case that the last exit time ρ is actually the time of maximum of L, which becomes apparent once one writes

$$L = \frac{Z}{1 - K} = \left(\frac{M}{y} \wedge 1\right) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2y}\Lambda^M(y)\right)$$

and use the facts that $\mathbb{P}[M_\rho = y] = 1$ and $\mathbb{P}\left[\Lambda^M_\rho(y) = \Lambda^M_\infty(y)\right] = 1$.

5. TIME OF MAXIMUM AND LAST-EXIT TIMES OF DOWNWARDS DRIFTING ONE-DIMENSIONAL LÉVY PROCESSES WITH NO POSITIVE JUMPS

5.1. **Set-up.** For the purposes of Section 5, Ω will be the canonical space of all càdlàg functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Let X denote the coordinate process and $\mathbf{F}$ be the right-continuous augmentation of the natural filtration of X. For the time being, the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ will be taken to be equal to $\mathcal{F}_\infty$. On $(\Omega, \mathbf{F})$, let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability under which X is a Lévy process with $X_0 = 0$ and no positive jumps. For information about Lévy processes, the interested reader can check [2], a book which we shall be referring to in the discussion that follows. An alternative reference is [30].

The law of X can be fully characterized by its *Laplace exponent* function $\theta : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, defined implicitly via $\exp(t\theta(z)) = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[\exp\left(zX_t\right)\right]$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The Lévy-Khintchin representation implies that

$$\theta(z) = \alpha z + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 z^2 + \int_{-\infty}^{0} \left(\exp(zx) - 1 - zx\mathbb{I}_{\{-1 \leq x < 0\}}\right) \nu[\mathrm{d}x] \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and ν is a measure on $(-\infty, 0)$ such that $\int_{-\infty}^{0} \left(1 \wedge |x|^2\right) \nu[\mathrm{d}x] < \infty$. The collection (α, σ^2, ν) is the *Lévy triplet* of X under $\mathbb{P}$.

Assumptions 5.1. The following will be enforced throughout Section 5:

1. At least one of σ^2 or ν is non-zero.
2. If $\sigma^2 = 0$ (in which case $\nu \neq 0$ necessarily holds), then $\alpha - \int_{-1}^{0} x\nu[\mathrm{d}x] > 0$.
3. $\alpha + \int_{-\infty}^{-1} x\nu[\mathrm{d}x] < 0$.

It is evident that condition (1) in Assumptions 5.1 is equivalent to asking that X is not deterministic. On the other hand, condition (2) in Assumptions 5.1 is equivalent to asking that X does not equal the negative of a subordinator. Indeed, let $\beta := \alpha - \int_{-1}^{0} x\nu[\mathrm{d}x] \in (-\infty, \infty]$. If it happens that $\sigma^2 = 0$ and $\beta \in (-\infty, \infty]$, the Levý-Ito path decomposition of X will imply that one can write

$$X = \beta t + \sum_{t \in [0, \cdot]} \Delta X_t,$$

which is clearly a non-increasing process; therefore, the negative of a subordinator. Finally, condition (3) is equivalent to asking that $\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = -\infty\right] = 1$, i.e., that X is downwards drifting. To see this, note that the function θ has a derivative θ' on $(0, \infty)$, and it is straightforward to see that $\theta'(0+) := \lim_{z \downarrow 0} \theta'(z) = \alpha + \int_{-\infty}^{-1} x\nu[\mathrm{d}x] < 0$, the last strict inequality holding from condition (3) of Assumptions 5.1. A straightforward argument shows that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[X_1\right] = \theta'(0+) < 0$, which immediately implies that $\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = -\infty\right] = 1$, in view of the law of large numbers.

Since times of maximum and last exit times for X will be considered later on, the above remarks imply that Assumptions 5.1 are essential for having a non-trivial discussion.

The Laplace exponent function θ is continuous and convex, and such that $\theta(0) = 0$. Furthermore, $\lim_{z\to\infty} \left(\theta(x)/z^2\right) = \sigma^2/2$, while if $\sigma^2 = 0$ one computes $\lim_{z\to\infty} \left(\theta(x)/z\right) = \alpha - \int_{-1}^{0} x\nu[\mathrm{d}x]$. By condition (2) in Assumptions 5.1, it follows that $\lim_{z\to\infty} \theta(z) = \infty$. The facts $\theta(0) = 0$, $\theta'(0+) < 0$ and $\lim_{z\to\infty} \theta(z) = \infty$, combined with the convexity of θ, imply that there exists a unique $q \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\theta(q) = 0$. Another straightforward argument using the Lévy property of

X and the definition of θ shows that the process $M := \exp(qX)$ is an exponential Lévy martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ such that $M_0 = 1$, M^* has continuous paths, and $\lim_{t \to \infty} M_t = 0$, all holding $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

5.2. **Time of maximum.** Define ρ as any random time such that $X_\rho = X^{\uparrow}_\infty$; it then follows that ρ is also a time of maximum of M. Then, by an application of Proposition 4.3 we obtain that the pair (K, L) associated with ρ is given by $K = 1 - \exp(-qX^{\uparrow})$ and $L = M = \exp(qX)$. Note also that Remark 4.4 implies that there is a unique time of overall maximum for a Lévy process satisfying Assumptions 5.1.

By Proposition 2.1, $K_\rho = K_\infty$ has the standard uniform distribution under $\mathbb{P}$, which implies that $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} X_t$ has the exponential distribution with rate q under $\mathbb{P}$. Furthermore, since $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_t] = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F})$ is the canonical space, the extension theorem of Daniell-Kolmogorov [19, §2.2A] implies that there exists a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F})$ such that L_t is the density of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_t$ each $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Standard arguments show that X is still a Lévy process with no positive jumps under $\mathbb{Q}$ and that its Laplace exponent $\theta_q : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$, defined implicitly via $\exp(t\theta_q(z)) = \mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}[\exp(zX_t)]$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$, is such that $\theta_q(z) = \theta(z + q)$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$. It is then immediate to see that the Lévy triplet $(\alpha_q, \sigma_q^2, \nu_q)$ of X under $\mathbb{Q}$ is given by $\alpha_q = \alpha + \sigma^2 q + \int_{-1}^0 (\exp(qx) - 1)\, x\nu[\mathrm{d}x]$, $\sigma_q^2 = \sigma^2$, and $\nu_q[\mathrm{d}x] = \exp(qx)\nu[\mathrm{d}x]$.

Since θ is convex and $\theta'(0+) < 0$, $\theta(q) = 0$, $\lim_{z \to \infty} \theta(z) = \infty$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{Q}[X_1] = \theta'_q(0+) = \theta'(q) > 0$; in other words, X becomes a Lévy submartingale under $\mathbb{Q}$. (The fact that $\theta'(q) > 0$ can be also obtained by the direct computation

$$\theta'(q) = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 q + \int_{-\infty}^0 \frac{1 - \exp(qx) + qx\exp(qx)}{q} \nu[\mathrm{d}x],$$

where it was used that $\alpha = -\sigma^2 q/2 - \int_{-\infty}^0 \left((\exp(qx) - 1)/q - x\mathbb{I}_{\{-1 \le x < 0\}} \right) \nu[\mathrm{d}x]$, following from $\theta(q) = 0$. As $q > 0$ and $1 - \exp(y) + y\exp(y) > 0$ holds for $y < 0$, under Assumptions 5.1 it is evident that $0 < \theta'(q) < \infty$.)

One can carry out the enlargement of the probability space as discussed in Remark 3.2 and assume that there exists a random variable U with the uniform law, independent of the process $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ under both $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$. Then, it comes as a consequence of Theorem 3.4 that a path of X^ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ can be stochastically realized as follows:

1. With U being a standard uniform random variable, set $X^{\uparrow}_\infty = X_\rho = (1/q)\log(U)$.
2. Given $x = X_\rho$, generate X^{τ_x} under $\mathbb{Q}$, where $\tau_x := \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid X_t = x\}$.

The above construction can be useful in the simulation of X until its maximum, but can also provide the joint Laplace transform of the law of (ρ, X_ρ) under $\mathbb{P}$, as well as formulas for the joint density of the law of (ρ, X_ρ). Before stating the result, note that θ_q is a strictly increasing and bijective mapping on $\mathbb{R}_+$; therefore, the mapping $\theta_q^{-1} : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is well defined and strictly increasing.

Proposition 5.2. *The joint Laplace transform of the law of* (ρ, X_ρ) *under* $\mathbb{P}$ *is given by*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\exp\left(-a\rho - bX_\rho\right)\right] = \frac{q}{q + \theta_q^{-1}(a) + b}, \quad \text{for } (a,b) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+. \tag{5.1}$$

Furthermore, the joint density of (ρ, X_ρ) *under* $\mathbb{P}$ *is given by*

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, X_\rho \in \mathrm{d}x] = q\mathbb{P}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]\mathrm{d}x = \frac{qx}{t}\mathbb{P}[X_t \in \mathrm{d}x]\mathrm{d}t, \quad \text{for } (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times (0,\infty). \tag{5.2}$$

In particular, the density of ρ *under* $\mathbb{P}$ *satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t] = \frac{q}{t}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X_t \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t > 0\}}\right]\mathrm{d}t, \quad \text{for } t \in (0,\infty).$$

Proof. Fix $(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+$. In view of the previous construction for the path X^ρ, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\exp\left(-a\rho - bX_\rho\right)\right] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\exp\left(-a\tau_x - bx\right)\right] q\exp(-qx)\mathrm{d}x \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\exp\left(-a\tau_x\right)\right] q\exp\left(-(q+b)x\right)\mathrm{d}x.\end{aligned}$$

Since X has no positive jumps under $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{Q}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = \infty\right] = 1$, a straightforward martingale argument gives $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}\left[\exp\left(-a\tau_x\right)\right] = \exp\left(-\theta_q^{-1}(a)\right)$. Then, (5.1) follows upon simple integration.

Using the same reasoning as above, upon conditioning on $X_\rho = x$ one can obtain the formula $\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, X_\rho \in \mathrm{d}x] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]q\exp(-qx)\mathrm{d}x$ for $(t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times (0,\infty)$. Since $(\mathrm{d}\mathbb{Q}/\mathrm{d}\mathbb{P})|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \exp(qX_t)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{Q}\left[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\exp(qX_t); \tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\exp(qx); \tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t\right] = \exp(qx)\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t\right].$$

(In fact, the formal equalities below can be justified because $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[L_t\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[\exp(qX_t)\right] = 1$ holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. One should also check the proof of Proposition 6.5 where the analogue of the above formula in the case of one-dimensional diffusions is proved; there, the process L may be a strict local martingale.) Combining the calculations above, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, X_\rho \in \mathrm{d}x] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]q\exp(-qx)\mathrm{d}x = q\mathbb{P}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]\mathrm{d}x, \quad \text{for } (t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times (0,\infty).$$

By [2, VII.1, Corollary 3] it holds that $t\mathbb{P}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]\mathrm{d}x = x\mathbb{P}[X_t \in \mathrm{d}x]\mathrm{d}t$, which gives the second equality in (5.2). Finally, the density of ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ follows upon integrating the first and third terms of (5.2) over $x \in (0,\infty)$. □

Example 5.3. Under $\mathbb{P}$, assume that X is a Brownian motion with strictly negative drift $-\mu$ (where $\mu > 0$) and unit diffusion coefficient. To connect with the previous notation, note that $\alpha = -\mu$, $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\nu = 0$. Hence, $\theta(z) = -\mu z + z^2/2$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$, which immediately gives $q = 2\mu$. In this case, $K = 1 - \exp(-2\mu X^\uparrow)$, and $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} X_t$ has the exponential distribution with rate 2μ under $\mathbb{P}$ — of course, this fact is well known.

Continuing, note that $\alpha_q = \mu$, $\sigma_q^2 = 1$ and $\nu_q = 0$. It follows that X under $\mathbb{Q}$ is a Brownian motion with positive drift μ and unit diffusion coefficient. Furthermore, $\theta_q(z) = \mu z + z^2/2$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}_+$; therefore, $\theta_q^{-1}(a) = \sqrt{\mu^2 + 2a} - \mu$ holds for $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$, which implies by (5.1) that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[\exp\left(-a\rho - bX_\rho\right)\right] = \frac{2\mu}{b + \mu + \sqrt{\mu^2 + 2a}}, \quad \text{for } (a, b) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Note that $\mathbb{P}[X_t \in \mathrm{d}x] = \left(1/\sqrt{2\pi t}\right) \exp(-(x + \mu t)^2/(2t))$ holds for $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty)$, in view of the fact that X is a Brownian motion with drift $-\mu$ and unit diffusion coefficient. Using (5.2), the joint density of (ρ, X_ρ) under $\mathbb{P}$ is given by:

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, X_\rho \in \mathrm{d}x] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi t^3}}\, \mu x \exp\left(-\frac{(x + \mu t)^2}{2t}\right) \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x, \quad \text{for } (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (0, \infty).$$

Either upon integration of the last equality or by recalling that $\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t] = (q/t)\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[X_t \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t > 0\}}\right] \mathrm{d}t$, for $t \in (0, \infty)$, one calculates the law of ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ as given by

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t] = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}\, \mu \left(\sqrt{t} \exp\left(-\mu^2 t/2\right) - \mu \int_{\mu\sqrt{t}}^{\infty} \exp(-s^2/2)\mathrm{d}s\right) \mathrm{d}t, \quad \text{for } t \in (0, \infty).$$

Remark 5.4. When passing from $\mathbb{P}$ to $\mathbb{Q}$, the Lévy measure changes by being weighted with an exponential function. Due to this very specific nature of measure change, in certain occasions the Lévy process remains within the same class. For example, this is the case when the pure jump part is a tempered one-sided stable processes; then, it holds that $\nu[\mathrm{d}x] = c\mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,0)}(x) \left(\exp(\lambda x)/|x|^{p+1}\right) \mathrm{d}x$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $0 < p < 2$. The simulation of such processes is analyzed in [26]. Of interest also is the case where the pure jump part is the negative of a Gamma process, which happens when $\nu[\mathrm{d}x] = c\mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,0)}(x) \left(\exp(\lambda x)/|x|\right) \mathrm{d}x$ for some $c > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$. In this case, it holds that

$$\theta(z) = \left(\alpha + c\frac{1 - \exp(-\lambda)}{\lambda}\right) z + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 z^2 + c \log\left(1 + \frac{z}{\lambda}\right),$$

and the determination of $q \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\theta(q) = 0$ is easily accomplished numerically.

5.3. **Last exit times.** We start with a discussion of the Markovian local time of X and its relationship with the semimartingale local time of M. If M^{c} denotes the continuous local martingale part of M on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$, it is straightforward that $[M^{\mathsf{c}}, M^{\mathsf{c}}] = \sigma^2 q^2 \int_{[0,\cdot]} \exp(2qX_{t-})\mathrm{d}t = \sigma^2 q^2 \int_{[0,\cdot]} \exp(2qX_t)\mathrm{d}t$. By the occupation-times formula [27, Corollary 1 of Theorem IV.70], for any Borel-measurable function $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ it holds that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} g(y)\Lambda^M_\cdot(y)\mathrm{d}y = \int_0^\cdot g(X_t)\mathrm{d}[M^{\mathsf{c}}, M^{\mathsf{c}}]_t = \sigma^2 q^2 \int_0^\cdot g(X_t) \exp(2qX_t)\mathrm{d}t.$$

In the present Lévy setting, two cases will be considered. When $\sigma^2 = 0$, i.e., when there is no Gaussian component, $\Lambda^M_t(y) = 0$ holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}_+$. On the other hand, if $\sigma^2 > 0$, every point $x \in \mathbb{R}$ is regular for itself (see [2, Corollary II.20(i) and Exercise II.5]) and non-polar (the latter holding because X has no positive jumps and is not equal to the negative of a subordinator).

Therefore, a combination of [2, Proposition I.2(i), Theorem V.15 and Exercise V.3] implies that there exists a random field $\widetilde{\Lambda}^X$ that is jointly continuous in the temporal and spatial variable, such that

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}^X(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int_0^{\cdot} \mathbb{I}_{\{|X_t - x| \leq \epsilon\}} \mathrm{d}t \right), \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In fact, $\widetilde{\Lambda}^X$ is the local time random field of the process X in the Markovian sense; then, if Λ^X denotes the semimartingale local time random field of X, the occupation-times formula immediately gives $\Lambda^X = \sigma^2 \widetilde{\Lambda}^X$. Furthermore, since $M = \exp(qX)$, straightforward computations using a combination of the two occupation-times formulas for Λ^X and Λ^M imply that we can choose Λ^M in a way so that $\Lambda^M(y) = qy\Lambda^X((1/q)\log(y))$ holds for all $y \in (0, \infty)$. In other words, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $y = \exp(qx)$, it holds that $(1/y)\Lambda^M(y) = q\Lambda^X(x) = q\sigma^2\widetilde{\Lambda}^X(x)$.

In the sequel, fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and define $\rho := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid X_t > x\}$, where we set $\rho = 0$ when the last set is empty. Recalling that $M = \exp(qX)$, it holds that $\rho := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid M_t > y\}$, where $y = \exp(qx)$. Therefore, the general results of Subsection 4.3 (in particular, equation (4.2)) together with the discussion of the previous paragraph give

$$K = 1 - (1 \wedge \exp(-qx)) \exp\left(-q\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\widetilde{\Lambda}^X(x) - q \sum_{t \in [0, \cdot]} \left((x - X_t)\, \mathbb{I}_{\{X_{t-} > x,\, X_t \leq x\}} \right) \right),$$

where the process $q\sigma^2\widetilde{\Lambda}^X(x)/2$ is to be understood equal to zero if $\sigma^2 = 0$ (even though in this case $\widetilde{\Lambda}^X(x)$ may not be well defined). The dynamics for L are given by (4.3).

Example 5.5. Recall the Brownian setting of Example 5.3. Assume that $x \in (-\infty, 0]$. In this case, $\widetilde{\Lambda}^X = \Lambda^X$, $q = 2\mu$, and there are no jumps; therefore, $K = 1 - \exp\left(-\mu\Lambda^X(x)\right)$. By Proposition 2.1 it follows that $\Lambda^X_\infty(x) = \Lambda^X_\rho(x)$ has the exponential distribution with rate parameter μ. In Example 6.8 a representation for the joint distribution of $(\rho,\, \Lambda^X_\infty)$ will be obtained. Using Novikov's condition [19, Section 3.5.D], it is straightforward to check that the local martingale L in (4.3) is an actual martingale. The extension theorem of Daniell-Kolmogorov [19, §2.2A] implies that Assumption 3.1 is valid in this case (modulo the enlargement of the probability space in order to accommodate a uniform random variable). It is straightforward to check that, under $\mathbb{Q}$, the process X has dynamics $\mathrm{d}X_t = -\mu \mathsf{sign}(X_t - x)\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{Q}}_t$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where $\mathsf{sign} = \mathbb{I}_{(0,\infty)} - \mathbb{I}_{(-\infty,0]}$ and $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\mathbb{Q}$. Dynamics like the ones of X under $\mathbb{Q}$ have been the object of study in previous literature; see, for example, [31] and [12, Subsection 5.2, page 96].

6. Time of Maximum and Last-Exit Times of One-Dimensional Downwards Transient Diffusions

6.1. **Set-up.** For the purposes of Section 6, fix $\ell \in [-\infty, \infty)$, and $r \in (-\infty, \infty]$ with $\ell < r$ and take Ω to be the canonical space of continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $[\ell, r]$ that remain constant after they assume the value ℓ or r. (In other words, ℓ and r are regarded as "absorbing states.")

The interval $[\ell, r]$ is equipped with the usual topology that makes it a compact set. Let X denote the coordinate process and $\mathbf{F}$ be the right-continuous augmentation of the natural filtration of X. Until further notice, the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ is taken to be equal to $\mathcal{F}_\infty$. For more information on the discussion below regarding one-dimensional diffusions, one can check [19, Section 5.5].

Remark 6.1. Note that the possibilities $\ell = -\infty$ and/or $r = \infty$ are allowed. The points ℓ and r, even if finite, should be regarded as "explosion" of the coordinate process X. Defining Ω as the set of càdlàg functions with values on the closed interval $[\ell, r]$ with ℓ and r being absorbing states is essential for ensuring that Assumption 3.1 is valid — see [23], as well as Example 6.4 later.

Define the open interval $I := (\ell, r)$. Consider functions $\alpha : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ such that σ^2 is strictly positive and $\sigma^{-2}(1 + |\alpha|)$ is locally integrable on I. From the treatment of [19, Section 5.5], under these assumptions, and for an initial condition $x_0 \in I$, there exists a probability $\mathbb{P} \equiv \mathbb{P}_{x_0}$ on $\mathcal{F}$ (which coincides with the Borel sigma-algebra on Ω) such that the coordinate process X satisfies $\mathbb{P}[X_0 = x_0] = 1$ and has dynamics

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = \alpha(X_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(X_t)\mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{P}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \zeta),$$

where $\zeta = \tau_\ell \wedge \tau_r$ with $\tau_\ell = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid X_t = \ell\}$ and $\tau_r = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid X_t = r\}$, and $W^{\mathbb{P}}$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\mathbb{P}$. (Note that $W^{\mathbb{P}}$ is in general defined only up to time ζ.) In other words, X is a diffusion up to the "explosion time" ζ.

Any non-constant twice-differentiable function $s : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ which satisfies the differential equation $\alpha(x)s'(x) + (1/2)\sigma^2(x)s''(x) = 0$ for $x \in I$ is called a *scale function*. Note that scale functions are unique up to affine transformation.

Assumptions 6.2. Throughout Section 6, along with σ^2 being strictly positive and $\sigma^{-2}(1 + |\alpha|)$ being locally integrable on I, it shall be assumed that $-\infty < s(\ell+) < s(r-) = \infty$ holds for some (and then for any) scale function s.

In view of Assumptions 6.2, one may consider a scale function s with the properties $s(l+) = 0$ and $s(x_0) = 1$. In other words, s will satisfy

$$s(x) = \left(\int_\ell^{x_0} \exp\left(-2 \int_c^v \frac{\alpha(w)}{\sigma^2(w)} \mathrm{d}w \right) \mathrm{d}v \right)^{-1} \int_\ell^x \exp\left(-2 \int_c^v \frac{\alpha(w)}{\sigma^2(w)} \mathrm{d}w \right) \mathrm{d}v, \quad \text{for } x \in I, \tag{6.1}$$

for some $c \in I$. (Note that the definition of s in (6.1) does not depend on the chosen point $c \in I$.)

Define $M := s(X)$, so that M is a continuous-path nonnegative local martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $M_0 = 1$. The martingale convergence theorem and Assumptions 6.2 can be seen to imply that $\mathbb{P}[\lim_{t\to\infty} M_t = 0] = 1$ — indeed, there is not possibility for any other limit for M, since σ^2 is strictly positive and $1/\sigma^2$ is locally integrable on (ℓ, r). It follows in a straightforward way that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = \ell\right] = 1;$$

in words, X is transient and drifts downwards (or explodes in finite time) to ℓ under $\mathbb{P}$.

6.2. **Time of maximum.** Define ρ to be a time of maximum for X: $\mathbb{P}\big[X_\rho = X^{\uparrow}_{\infty}\big] = 1$. Note that ρ is also a maximum time of $M = s(X)$, since s is nondecreasing, and M is a nonnegative local martingale with $\mathbb{P}[M_0 = 1] = 1$, continuous paths satisfying $\mathbb{P}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} M_t = 0\right] = 1$. By the general discussion of Subsection 4.2, Let (K, L) the the canonical pair associated with ρ on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{P})$. We claim that $L = s(X)$ and $K = 1 - 1/s(X^{\uparrow})$.

In order to characterize the probability $\mathbb{Q}$ that L induces as in Assumption 3.1, note that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t}{L_t} = \frac{\mathrm{d}s(X_t)}{s(X_t)} = q(X_t)\sigma(X_t)\mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{P}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \zeta),$$

where $q : I \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined via $q(x) = s'(x)/s(x)$ for $x \in I$. If L was actually the density process of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$, Girsanov's theorem would imply that the dynamics of X under $\mathbb{Q}$ are $\mathrm{d}X_t = \alpha_q(X_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(X_t)\mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{Q}}_t$, with $\alpha_q := \alpha + \sigma^2 q$ and $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ being a standard Brownian motion on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{Q})$. Even though L might not be a martingale on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{P})$, we may proceed using knowledge of existence of weak solutions of stochastic differential equations. Indeed, σ^2 is strictly positive on I and $\sigma^{-2}(1 + |\alpha_q|) = \sigma^{-2}(1 + |\alpha|) + q$ is locally integrable on I, the latter holding because $\sigma^{-2}(1+|\alpha|)$ is locally integrable on I in view of Assumption 6.2 and q is locally integrable on I because it is continuous. Again, the treatment of [19, Section 5.5] implies that there exists a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega,\, \mathcal{F})$ such that the coordinate process X satisfies

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = \alpha_q(X_t)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(X_t)\mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{Q}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \zeta),$$

where $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\mathbb{Q}$, in general defined until time ζ. It is clear that $\mathbb{Q}$ is exactly the probability associated with L satisfying Assumption 3.1, modulo the enlargement of the space discussed in Remark 3.2. We claim that

$$\mathbb{Q}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = r\right] = 1;$$

i.e., that X is transient and drifts upwards (or explodes in finite time) to r under $\mathbb{Q}$. Indeed, $\mathbb{Q}\left[M_t > 0, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+\right] = 1$ holds and $1/M$ is a local $\mathbb{Q}$-martingale. Now, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $r_n := (1 - 1/n)r + (1/n)x_0$. Obviously, $M^{\tau_{r_n}}$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{Q}\left[\tau_{r_n} < \infty\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[M_{\tau_{r_n}} \mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_{r_n} < \infty\}}\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[M_{\tau_{r_n}}\right] = 1.$$

As $\lim_{n\to\infty} s(r_n) = \infty$ and $1/M$ is a local $\mathbb{Q}$-martingale, we deduce that $\mathbb{Q}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} M_t = \infty\right] = 1$; this implies that $\mathbb{Q}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = r\right] = 1$.

Remark 6.3. There is an alternative proof of the fact that $\mathbb{Q}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = r\right] = 1$. Since the process $L(1/s(X)) = 1$ is a local martingale on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{P})$, one can show that the process $1/s(X)$ is a local martingale on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{Q})$. (In order to justify the last claim, a generalized version of the so-called Bayes' formula is needed; see, for example, [29, Theorem 5.1].) In other words, the function $-1/s$ is a scale function for the diffusion X on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{Q})$. Observe that $-1/s$ is bounded above and unbounded below, which coupled with the facts that σ is strictly positive and $1/\sigma^2$ is locally integrable on (ℓ, r) imply that X is upwards drifting toward r under $\mathbb{Q}$.

Example 6.4. We pause the flow to give an example that will settle a couple of claims that were previously made in Remark 3.3.

Let $\ell = 0$, $r = \infty$, and $x_0 = 1$. Set $\alpha(x) = 0$ and $\sigma(x) = 1 \vee x^2$ for $x \in (0, \infty)$. In this case, s is the identity function on I, since X is already a local martingale on $(\Omega,\ \mathbf{F},\ \mathbb{P})$. In fact, this process is a strict local martingale in the terminology of [10], as follows from results in [7]. Using Feller's test for explosions, it is straightforward to check that $\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_\infty \leq t\right] = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_0 \leq t\right] > 0$ holds for all $t \in (0, \infty)$. Under $\mathbb{Q}$, the drift process of X satisfies $\alpha_q(x) = x^3 \vee (1/x)$ for $x \in I$. Writing the formal dynamics under $\mathbb{Q}$ of $1/X$ up to $\tau_n \wedge \tau_{1/n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it is straightforward to conclude that the law of the process $1/X^\zeta$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ is the same as the law of the process X under $\mathbb{P}$. In other words, $\mathbb{Q}\left[\tau_\infty \leq t\right] > 0$ and $\mathbb{Q}\left[\tau_0 \leq t\right] = 0$ holds for all $t \in (0, \infty)$. Coupled with the fact that $\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_\infty \leq t\right] = 0$ and $\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_0 \leq t\right] > 0$ holds for all $t \in (0, \infty)$ that was established above, we conclude that neither $\mathbb{Q} \ll_{\mathcal{F}_t} \mathbb{P}$ nor $\mathbb{P} \ll_{\mathcal{F}_t} \mathbb{Q}$ holds, for any $t \in (0, \infty)$.

The above example also illustrates that the filtration $\mathbf{F}$ should not be completed in any way by $\mathbb{P}$, if $\mathbb{Q}$ is to be defined. In fact, let $\mathbf{F}^{\mathbb{P}} = (\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_t)_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+}$ be *any* right-continuous filtration such that:

- $\mathbf{F} \subseteq \mathbf{F}^{\mathbb{P}}$, and
- if $B \subseteq \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n$, where $B_n \in \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{R}_+} \mathcal{F}_t$ and $\mathbb{P}\left[B_n\right] = 0$ holds for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $B \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_0$.

(Note that we are *not* asking that each $\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_t$, $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, contains all $\mathbb{P}$-null sets of $\mathcal{F}_\infty$, but a weaker condition that is tailored to avoid problems with singularities of probabilities at infinity — see [3] for the concept of such *natural*, as opposed to *usual*, augmentations.) For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\{\tau_\infty \leq n\} \in \mathcal{F}_n$ and $\mathbb{P}\left[\tau_\infty \leq n\right] = 0$. In view of the assumptions on $\mathbf{F}^{\mathbb{P}}$, $\{\tau_\infty < \infty\} \in \mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_0$. If $\mathbb{Q}$ could be defined, $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_{\eta u}} \ll \mathbb{P}|_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_{\eta u}}$ would hold for $u \in [0, 1)$; in particular, $\mathbb{Q}^{\mathbb{P}}|_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_0} \ll \mathbb{P}|_{\mathcal{F}^{\mathbb{P}}_0}$. This is impossible: if $\mathbb{Q}$ could be defined we would have $\mathbb{Q}[\tau_\infty < \infty] = 1$, while $\mathbb{P}[\tau_\infty < \infty] = 0$ holds. Of course, since the filtration is *not* enlarged in order to include $\mathbb{P}$-null sets, we can indeed define $\mathbb{Q}$ with no problems.

In order to be in par with Assumption 3.1, we carry out the enlargement of the probability space as discussed in Remark 3.2. Then, it comes as a consequence of Theorem 3.4 that a path of X^ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ can be stochastically realized as follows:

1. With U being a standard uniform random variable, set $X^\uparrow_\infty = X_\rho = s^{-1}\left(1/U\right)$.
2. Given $x = X_\rho$, generate X^{τ_x} under $\mathbb{Q}$, where $\tau_x := \inf\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid X_t = x\right\}$.

From step (1) above, one computes that $\mathbb{P}[X^\uparrow_\infty \in \mathrm{d}x] = \left(q(x)/s(x)\right)\mathrm{d}x$ holds for $x \in (x_0, r)$. In fact, combining the two steps in above construction implies the following result:

Proposition 6.5. *The joint law of* $(\rho, X^\uparrow_\infty)$ *under* $\mathbb{P}$ *is given by:*

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\ X^\uparrow_\infty \in \mathrm{d}x] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]\frac{q(x)}{s(x)}\mathrm{d}x = \mathbb{P}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]q(x)\mathrm{d}x, \quad \textit{for } (t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (x_0, r). \tag{6.2}$$

Proof. We only have to show that $s(x)\mathbb{P}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]$ holds for all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (x_0, r)$. Start by noticing that, since $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[M_{\tau_x}] = 1$, we have $\mathbb{Q}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_x}} \ll \mathbb{P}|_{\mathcal{F}_{\tau_x}}$ and $M_{\tau_x} = s(x)\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_x<\infty\}}$ is the density of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_x}$. Now,

$$s(x)\mathbb{P}\left[t < \tau_x < \infty\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\left[M_{\tau_x}\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_x<\infty\}}\mathbb{I}_{\{\tau_x>t\}}\right] = \mathbb{Q}\left[\tau_x > t\right] = \mathbb{Q}\left[t < \tau_x < \infty\right],$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\mathbb{Q}\left[\lim_{t\to\infty} X_t = r\right] = 1$. Therefore, the equality $s(x)\mathbb{P}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_x \in \mathrm{d}t]$ holds for all $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (x_0, r)$, which concludes the proof. □

Example 6.6. Assume that $\alpha(x) = (1 - 2a)/2x$ and $\sigma(x) = 1$ for all $x \in I = (0, \infty)$, where $a \in (0, \infty)$. This corresponds to X being a Bessel process of index $-a$ (i.e., dimension $2 - 2a$) starting from $x_0 \in I$, absorbed at zero. It is straightforward to check that $s(x) = (x/x_0)^{2a}$ for $x \in I$; then, $q(x) = 2a/x$ and $\alpha_q(x) = (1 + 2a)/2x$ for $x \in I$. When ρ is the time of the maximum of X, $K = 1 - \exp\left(-(X^{\uparrow}/x_0)^{2a}\right)$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ is the probability that makes X a Bessel process of index a (i.e., dimension $2 + 2a$) starting from $x_0 \in I$. Then, in view of [4, page 398, formula (2.0.2)], one can use the first equality in (6.2) and show that, for $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times (x_0, \infty)$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, X^{\uparrow}_{\infty} \in \mathrm{d}x] = \frac{2ax_0^a}{x^{a+3}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{j_{a,k} J_a\left(j_{a,k}x/x_0\right)}{J_{a+1}\left(j_{a,k}\right)} \exp\left(-\frac{j_{a,k}^2}{2x^2}t\right)\right) \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}x.$$

Above, J_a (resp. J_{a+1}) is the Bessel function of the first kind of order a (resp., $a+1$) and $(j_{a,k})_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the increasing sequence of positive zeros of J_a.

6.3. **Last exit times.** Fix $x \in (\ell, x_0]$, and define $\rho := \sup\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid X_\rho > x\}$. Recall that $M = s(X)$. With $y := s(x)$, it follows that ρ is the last exit time of M from the interval (y, ∞). According to the discussion in Subsection 4.3, the dynamics of L are formally given by

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t}{L_t} = \mathbb{I}_{\{M_t\le y\}}\frac{\mathrm{d}M_t}{M_t} = \mathbb{I}_{\{X_t\le x\}}q(X_t)\sigma(X_t)\mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{P}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \zeta),$$

where recall that $q := s'/s$. Using again knowledge of existence of weak solutions of stochastic differential equations from [19, Section 5.5], we obtain the existence a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that the coordinate process X formally satisfies

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = \left(\alpha(X_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t>x\}} + \alpha_q(X_t)\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t\le x\}}\right)\mathrm{d}t + \sigma(X_t)\mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{Q}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \zeta),$$

where the process $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\alpha_q = \alpha + q\sigma^2$, as was defined in Subsection 6.2. It is then straightforward to check that $\mathbb{Q}$ is the probability associated with the local $\mathbb{P}$-martingale L from Assumption 3.1.

When X is above the level x, the dynamics of X coincide with the ones under $\mathbb{P}$; on the other hand, when X is below the level x, the dynamics of X coincide with the ones under the $\mathbb{Q}$-probability of Subsection 6.2 in the case where ρ is a time of maximum of X. Under the present probability $\mathbb{Q}$, X is reverting towards the level x. In fact, X becomes a recurrent, rather than transient, diffusion. In order to see this, recall that the original scale function s is unbounded above, while the scale function corresponding to the $\mathbb{Q}$-probability of Subsection 6.2 is unbounded below, as follows from Remark 6.3. It then follows that the scale function corresponding to the present set-up is unbounded both above and below. Since σ^2 is strictly positive and $1/\sigma^2$ is locally integrable on I, the transience of standard Brownian motion and the celebrated result of Dambis, Dubins and Schwarz [19, Theorem 3.4.6] imply that X is transient under $\mathbb{Q}$. In particular, $\mathbb{Q}[\zeta < \infty] = 1$.

Recalling that $y = s(x)$, it is straightforward to check from defining properties of local times (or the occupation times formula) that $\Lambda^M(y) = s'(x)\Lambda^X(x)$; therefore, the general formula $K = 1 - \exp\left(-(1/2y)\Lambda^M(y)\right)$ of Remark 4.8 (recall that $x \in (\ell, x_0])$ becomes

$$K = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{q(x)}{2}\Lambda^X(x)\right).$$

Modulo the enlargement of the probability space described in Remark 3.2, Theorem 3.4 implies that a path of X^ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ can be stochastically realized as follows:

(1) With U being a standard uniform random variable, set $\Lambda^X_\infty(x) = -\left(2/q(x)\right)\log(U)$.
(2) Given $\lambda = \Lambda^X_\infty(x)$, generate $X^{\tau_\lambda(x)}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$, where $\tau_\lambda(x) := \inf\left\{t \in \mathbb{R}_+ \mid \Lambda^X_t(x) = \lambda\right\}$.

The law of $\Lambda^X_\infty(x) = \Lambda^X_\rho(x)$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is exponential with rate parameter $q(x)/2$. Combining the two steps in above construction, the following result is immediate:

Proposition 6.7. *The joint law of* $\left(\rho,\, \Lambda^X_\infty(x)\right)$ *under* $\mathbb{P}$ *is given by:*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, \Lambda^X_\infty(x) \in \mathrm{d}\lambda\right] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_\lambda(x) \in \mathrm{d}t]\frac{q(x)}{2}\exp\left(-\frac{q(x)}{2}\lambda\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda, \quad \textit{for } (t, \lambda) \in (0,\infty) \times (0, \infty).$$

Example 6.8. Recall the Brownian setting of Example 5.5. Fix $x \in (-\infty, 0]$. As $q(x) = 2\mu$ for all $x \in (-\infty, 0]$, it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, \Lambda^X_\infty(x) \in \mathrm{d}\lambda\right] = \mathbb{Q}[\tau_\lambda(x) \in \mathrm{d}t]\mu\exp\left(-\mu\lambda\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda, \text{ for } (t, \lambda) \in (0,\infty) \times (0, \infty).$$

In order to compute $\mathbb{Q}[\tau_\lambda(x) \in \mathrm{d}t]$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $\mathbb{W}$ be the probability on $(\Omega,\, \mathcal{F})$ that makes X a standard Brownian motion. A straightforward use of Girsanov's theorem implies that

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{Q}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbb{W}}\Big|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \exp\left(-\mu\int_0^t \mathsf{sign}(X_s - x)\mathrm{d}X_s - \frac{\mu^2}{2}t\right) = \exp\left(-\mu x - \mu|X_t - x| + \mu\Lambda^X_t(x) - \frac{\mu^2}{2}t\right)$$

for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, where the second equality follows from Tanaka's formula. (Note that Λ^X is the same under $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathbb{W}$.) As $X_{\tau_\lambda(x)} = x$ and $\Lambda^X_{\tau_\lambda(x)}(x) = \lambda$ hold $\mathbb{W}$-a.s., we obtain

$$\mathbb{Q}[\tau_\lambda(x) \in \mathrm{d}t] = \exp\left(\mu(\lambda - x) - \frac{\mu^2}{2}t\right)\mathbb{W}[\tau_\lambda(x) \in \mathrm{d}t], \quad t \in (0, \infty).$$

Using also the fact that

$$\mathbb{W}\left[\tau_\lambda(x) \in \mathrm{d}t\right] = \frac{\lambda - x}{\sqrt{2\pi t^3}}\exp\left(-\frac{(\lambda - x)^2}{2t}\right)\mathrm{d}t, \quad t \in (0, \infty),$$

which follows from distributional properties of the maximal process of Brownian motion coupled with Lévy's equivalence theorem on Brownian local time and maximum of Brownian motion (see, for example, [19, Theorem 3.6.17]), it follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t,\, \Lambda^X_\infty(x) \in \mathrm{d}\lambda\right] = \mu \frac{\lambda - x}{\sqrt{2\pi t^3}} \exp\left(-\mu x - \frac{\mu^2}{2}t - \frac{(\lambda-x)^2}{2t}\right) \mathrm{d}t\mathrm{d}\lambda, \quad \text{for } (t,\lambda) \in (0,\infty)\times(0,\infty).$$

Simple integration gives the law of ρ under $\mathbb{P}$ as

$$\mathbb{P}[\rho \in \mathrm{d}t] = \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{2\pi t}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu t + x)^2}{2t}\right) \mathrm{d}t, \quad \text{for } t \in (0,\infty).$$

Example 6.9. Recall the Bessel-process setting of Example 6.6. When ρ is the last-passage time of X at level $x \in (0, x_0]$, then $K = 1 - \exp\left(-(\alpha/2x)\Lambda^X(x)\right)$; under $\mathbb{Q}$ the process X has dynamics

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = \frac{1 - \mathsf{sign}(X_t - x)\alpha}{2X_t}\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{Q}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

where $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a standard Brownian motion under $\mathbb{Q}$.

7. Time of Maximum and Last-Passage Times of Brownian motion with Drift over Finite Time-Intervals

7.1. **Set-up.** For the purposes of Section 7, $T \in \mathbb{R}_+$ will be fixed. Define Ω as the canonical path-space of continuous functions from $[0,T)$ to $\mathbb{R}$. Call X the coordinate process, let $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\in[0,T)}$ be the right-continuous augmentation of the natural filtration of X, and set $\mathcal{F} = \bigvee_{t\in[0,T)} \mathcal{F}_t$.

Remark 7.1. It is important to note that the canonical space of processes with time-index $[0,T)$, as opposed to $[0,T]$, is considered here. As will become clear, it is in this setting that we can ensure later the validity of Assumption 3.1.

Fix some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. On $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$, let $\mathbb{P}$ be the probability under which X a Brownian motion with drift μ and unit diffusion coefficient on $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{P})$. In the rest of Section 7 we shall discuss the canonical pair and the behavior of X under the corresponding $\mathbb{Q}$ for the cases of time of maximum and last-passage times of X.

7.2. **Time of maximum.** Define $\rho := \sup\left\{t \in [0,T) \mid X_t = \sup_{s\in[0,T)} X_s\right\}$, where by convention one sets $\rho = T$ if the previous set is empty.

In the sequel, we shall make use of the following functions, related to the standard normal law:

$$\overline{\Phi}(x) = \int_x^\infty \phi(y)\mathrm{d}y, \quad \text{where } \phi(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right), \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Define the function $F_\mu : (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto [0,1]$ via

$$\begin{aligned} F_\mu(\tau, z) &= \exp\left(2\mu z\right)\overline{\Phi}\left(\frac{z+\mu\tau}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right) + \overline{\Phi}\left(\frac{z-\mu\tau}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right) \\ &= \int_0^\tau \left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{2\pi s^3}}\exp\left(-\frac{(z-\mu s)^2}{2s}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}s, \quad \text{for } (\tau,z) \in (0,\infty)\times\mathbb{R}_+. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

The equality between the two representations follows upon differentiation of the right-hand-side of (7.1) with respect to the temporal variable. The fact that F_μ is $[0,1]$-valued follows from the second representation, since the quantity inside the integral is the density of the first hitting time of the level z for Brownian motion with drift μ — see [19, page 197, equation (5.12)]. Furthermore, from this representation and the Markovian property of Brownian motion, it is straightforward to compute that

$$Z_t = \mathbb{P}[\rho > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = F_\mu\left(T - t, X^\uparrow_t - X_t\right), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T),$$

where recall that $X^\uparrow = \sup_{t \in [0,\cdot]} X$.

In preparation for the formulas below, note that

$$\frac{\partial F_\mu}{\partial z}(\tau, z) = 2\mu \exp(2\mu z)\, \overline{\Phi}\left(\frac{z + \mu\tau}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\tau}}\phi\left(\frac{z - \mu\tau}{\sqrt{\tau}}\right), \quad \text{for } (\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{7.2}$$

where the fact that $\exp(2\mu z)\, \phi(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}) = \phi(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau})$ for $(\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+$ holds was used in the above calculation. Define also the function $f_\mu : (0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ via

$$f_\mu(\tau) := -\frac{\partial F_\mu}{\partial z}(\tau, 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tau}} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu^2 \tau}{2}\right) - 2\mu\overline{\Phi}(\mu\sqrt{\tau}), \quad \text{for } \tau \in (0, \infty).$$

Upon simple differentiation it is easy to check that the function f_μ is decreasing in $\tau \in (0, \infty)$. As $\lim_{\tau \to \infty} f_\mu(\tau) = \max\{0, -2\mu\} \in \mathbb{R}_+$, f_μ is nonnegative.

Since Z has continuous paths and all martingales on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ have continuous paths as well, it follows that A is the continuous nondecreasing process appearing in the additive Doob-Meyer decomposition of $-Z$. In view of Proposition 2.1, ρ avoids all stopping times on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$. A simple use of Itô's formula gives, after some term-cancellations, that

$$\mathrm{d}Z_t = -\frac{\partial F_\mu}{\partial z}\left(T - t, X^\uparrow_t - X_t\right) \mathrm{d}\left(X_t - \mu t\right) - f_\mu(T - t)\mathrm{d}X^\uparrow_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T). \tag{7.3}$$

In particular, it holds that $A = \int_0^\cdot f_\mu(T - t)\mathrm{d}X^\uparrow_t$. From (1.1), it then follows that

$$K_t = 1 - \exp\left(-\int_0^t f_\mu(T - s)\mathrm{d}X^\uparrow_s\right), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T). \tag{7.4}$$

Using the equality $L = Z/(1 - K)$, it follows that

$$L_t = F_\mu\left(T - t, X^\uparrow_t - X_t\right) \exp\left(\int_0^t f_\mu(T - s)\mathrm{d}X^\uparrow_s\right), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T). \tag{7.5}$$

The next result ensures that Assumption 3.1 will be valid in this setting.

Lemma 7.2. *For all $t \in [0, T)$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_t] = 1$.*

Proof. Since $(L_t)_{t \in [0,T)}$ is a nonnegative local martingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with $L_0 = 1$, $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L_t] = 1$ for all $t \in [0, T)$ will follow if $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L^*_t] < \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T)$ is established. Given that the function F_μ is a $[0, 1]$-valued and that the function f_μ is decreasing, (7.5) implies that $L^*_t \leq \exp\left(f_\mu(T - t)X^\uparrow_t\right)$ holds for all $t \in [0, T)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}[L^*_t] < \infty$ for all $t \in [0, T)$ will follow if it is established that

$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}\big[\exp(aX^{\uparrow}_t)\big] < \infty$ holds for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. To see this, note first that in view of Girsanov's theorem and Hölder's inequality, we may assume that $\mu = 0$. Then, the claim follows because, for $\mu = 0$, the law of $X^{\uparrow}_t$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is the same as the law of $|X_t|$ under $\mathbb{P}$, and all exponential moments of the latter law are finite. □

By Lemma 7.2 and the extension theorem of Daniell-Kolmogorov [19, Subsection 2.2A], there exists a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that L_t is the density of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_t$ for all $t \in [0, T)$. (It is exactly here that the point of Remark 7.1 becomes relevant.) It follows either from (7.3) of from (7.5) that the dynamics of L are

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t}{L_t} = -\frac{(\partial F_\mu/\partial z)\left(T-t, X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t\right)}{F_\mu\left(T-t, X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t\right)}\mathrm{d}\left(X_t - \mu t\right), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T).$$

A straightforward application of Girsanov's theorem imply that, under $\mathbb{Q}$, the dynamics of X are

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = G_\mu\left(T-t, X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t\right)\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W^{\mathbb{Q}}_t, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T), \tag{7.6}$$

where $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a standard Brownian motion on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$ and $G_\mu : (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a function satisfying $G_\mu(\tau, z) = \mu - (\partial F_\mu/\partial z)(\tau, z)/F_\mu(\tau, z)$ for $(\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. A use of (7.2) gives

$$G_\mu(\tau, z) = \mu + \frac{(2/\sqrt{\tau})\,\phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - 2\mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) - \mu\exp\left(2\mu z\right)\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)}{\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) + \exp\left(2\mu z\right)\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)}, \quad \text{for } (\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+. \tag{7.7}$$

Proposition 7.3. *The function G_μ has the following properties:*

- $G_\mu(\tau, z) \geq 0$ *for all* $(\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+$.
- $\liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0}\left(\inf_{z \in [w, \infty)}\left(\tau G_\mu(\tau, z)\right)\right) \geq w$ *for all* $w \in (0, \infty)$.

It follows that X is a local submartingale on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$, and that $\mathbb{Q}\big[\liminf_{t \to T}(X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t) = 0\big] = 1$.

Remark 7.4. The fact that $\mathbb{Q}\big[\liminf_{t \to T}(X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t) = 0\big] = 1$ is the equivalent of $\mathbb{Q}[\rho = T] = 1$ that was obtained in the finite-horizon discrete-time analogue discussed in Example 4.2. However, in contrast to Example 4.2, the fact that $\mathbb{P}\big[\lim_{t \to T}(X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t) > 0\big] = 1$ implies that in the present setting $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ are singular probabilities on $\mathcal{F}$. (Note also that $\mathbb{P}\big[\liminf_{t \to T}(X^{\uparrow}_t - X_t) > 0\big] = 1$ implies $\mathbb{P}\big[\lim_{t \to T} L_t = 0\big] = 1$, which directly shows the singularity of $\mathbb{P}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ on $\mathcal{F}$.)

Proof of Proposition 7.3. Let $c \in \mathbb{R}$ and $d \in \mathbb{R}$. A simple change of variables implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\exp(2cd)\overline{\Phi}(c+d) &= \int_{c+d}^{\infty} \exp\left(2cd - \frac{x^2}{2}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\sqrt{2\pi}} = \int_{d-c}^{\infty} \exp\left(2cd - \frac{(x+2c)^2}{2}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \\ &= \int_{d-c}^{\infty} \exp\left(2c(d-c-x)\right)\exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{2}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\sqrt{2\pi}}.\end{aligned}$$

When $x \geq d - c$, it holds that $c\exp\left(2c(d-c-x)\right) \leq c$, for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Therefore, from the equalities above we obtain $c\exp(2cd)\overline{\Phi}(c+d) \leq c\overline{\Phi}(d-c)$. Applying the previous inequality above with $c = \mu\sqrt{\tau}$ and $d = z/\sqrt{\tau}$, it follows that $\mu\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) - \mu \exp\left(2\mu z\right) \overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) \geq 0$ for all $(\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+$. By (7.7), we obtain

$$G_\mu(\tau, z) \geq \frac{(2/\sqrt{\tau})\, \phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)}{\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) + \exp\left(2\mu z\right) \overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)}, \quad \text{for all } (\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+, \tag{7.8}$$

from which it immediately follows that G_μ is a nonnegative function. The fact that X is a local submartingale in $(\Omega,\, \mathbf{F},\, \mathbb{Q})$ then follows from the dynamics (7.6).

Continuing, fix $w \in (0, \infty)$. Using the uniform estimates $1 - 1/x^2 \leq x\overline{\Phi}(x)/\phi(x) \leq 1$, valid for $x \in (0, \infty)$ (see, for example, [8, Theorem 1.2.3, page 11]), and the fact that the equality $\exp\left(2\mu z\right) \phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) = \phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)$ holds for all $(\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+$, we obtain that

$$\lim_{\tau \downarrow 0} \left(\inf_{z \geq w} \left(\frac{2\sqrt{\tau}\phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)}{\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} - \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right) + \exp\left(2\mu z\right) \Phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau} + \mu\sqrt{\tau}\right)} \right) \right) = w.$$

Therefore, (7.8) gives $\liminf_{\tau \downarrow 0} \left(\inf_{z \geq w} \left(\tau G(\tau, z) \right) \right) \geq w$ for all $w \in (0, \infty)$. According to this fact and the dynamics given in (7.6), on the event $\big\{ \liminf_{t \to T} (X^\uparrow_t - X_t) > 0 \big\}$ one would obtain $\lim_{t \to T} X_t = \infty$ under $\mathbb{Q}$ — indeed, the drift term in the dynamics (7.6) would behave like $1/(T - t)$ for t close to T, implying that X itself would behave like $-\log(T - t)$ for t close to T. However, in that case it is clear that $\lim_{t \to T} (X^\uparrow_t - X_t) = 0$ will hold on $\big\{ \liminf_{t \to T} (X^\uparrow_t - X_t) > 0 \big\}$ under $\mathbb{Q}$, since $X_t < \infty$ holds for all $t \in [0, T)$. We conclude that $\mathbb{Q}\big[\liminf_{t \to T} (X^\uparrow_t - X_t) = 0 \big] = 1$. $\square$

Remark 7.5. When $\mu = 0$, the formulas simplify significantly. In this case, $F_0(\tau, z) = 2\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau}\right)$ for $(\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+$, the function $f_0 : (0, \infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ becomes $f_0(\tau) = 1/\sqrt{2\pi\tau}$ for $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, and the function G_0 appearing in the dynamics (7.6) is given by

$$G_0(\tau, z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{\phi\left(z/\sqrt{\tau}\right)}{\overline{\Phi}\left(z/\sqrt{\tau}\right)}, \quad \text{for } (\tau, z) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+.$$

Upon differentiation, both with respect to the spatial and the temporal variable, it can be shown that $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}_+ \ni (\tau, z) \mapsto G_0(\tau, z)$ is decreasing in τ and increasing in z. This is a very plausible behavior: recalling the dynamics (7.6) under $\mathbb{Q}$, one would expect the drift to increase both when X is moving away from its maximum and when the "time to maturity" $\tau = T - t$ is getting shorter.

Remark 7.6. It is conjectured that the function $(0, \infty) \times (0, \infty) \ni (\tau, z) \mapsto G_\mu(\tau, z)$ is decreasing in τ and increasing in z for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ — this was discussed for the case $\mu = 0$ in Remark 7.5. However, the calculations towards proving such a statement for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ seem quite tedious.

Remark 7.7. When $\mu \in (-\infty, 0)$, it is straightforward to calculate

$$\lim_{\tau \to \infty} F_\mu(\tau, z) = \exp(2\mu z) = \exp(-2|\mu| z) \text{ and } \lim_{\tau \to \infty} G_\mu(\tau, z) = -\mu = |\mu| \text{ for all } z \in \mathbb{R}_+,$$

as well as $\lim_{\tau \to \infty} f_\mu(\tau, z) = -2\mu = 2|\mu|$. Formally plugging these long-run limits in (7.4), (7.5) and (7.6), the set-up and results of Example 5.3 are recovered. (To avoid confusion, it is worthwhile to note that $\mu \in (0, \infty)$ of Example 5.3 corresponds to $-\mu = |\mu|$ in the setting of Subsection 7.2.)

7.3. **Last-passage times.** Fix $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and define $\rho := \sup\{t \in [0,T) \mid X_t = x\}$, where one sets $\rho = 0$ if the previous set is empty. Recalling the definition of the function F_μ from (7.1), it is straightforward to compute

$$Z_t = \mathbb{P}[\rho > t \mid \mathcal{F}_t] = F_\mu\left(T-t, x - X_t\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t \leq x\}} + F_{-\mu}\left(T-t, X_t - x\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t > x\}}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0,T). \tag{7.9}$$

In particular, $Z_0 = \mathbb{P}[\rho > 0] = 1 - F_{\mathsf{sign}(x)\mu}(T, |x|)$. Define also the function $h_\mu : (0,\infty) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ via

$$h_\mu(\tau) := -\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial F_\mu}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial F_{-\mu}}{\partial z}\right)(\tau, 0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\tau}}\exp\left(-\frac{\mu^2\tau}{2}\right) - \mu\left(1 - 2\overline{\Phi}(\mu\sqrt{\tau})\right), \quad \text{for } \tau \in (0,\infty).$$

Upon differentiation, one checks that the function h_μ is decreasing in $\tau \in (0,\infty)$.

By a straightforward generalization of the Itô-Tanaka formula, one can write $Z = N - A$, where N is a local martingale (with necessarily continuous paths) and $A = \int_0^\cdot h_\mu(T-t)\mathrm{d}\Lambda_t^X(x)$. Recalling that $\mathbb{P}[\rho > 0] = 1 - F_{\mathsf{sign}(x)\mu}(T, |x|)$, it follows from (1.1) that

$$K_t = 1 - \left(1 - F_{\mathsf{sign}(x)\mu}(T, |x|)\right)\exp\left(-\int_0^t h_\mu(T-s)\mathrm{d}\Lambda_s^X(x)\right), \quad \text{for } t \in [0,T). \tag{7.10}$$

Since $L = Z/(1-K)$, (7.9) and (7.10) give a closed-form expression for L.

Lemma 7.8. *For all* $t \in [0,T)$*, it holds that* $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[L_t\right] = 1$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 7.2, it will be shown that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[L_t^*\right] < \infty$ holds for all $t \in [0,T)$. Since $L \leq 1/(1-K)$ and h_μ is decreasing, it follows that $L_t^* \leq \exp\left(h_\mu(T-t)\Lambda_t^X(x)\right)$ holds for all $t \in [0,T)$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[L_t^*\right] < \infty$ for all $t \in [0,T)$ will follow if it is established that $\mathbb{E}_\mathbb{P}\left[\exp(a\Lambda_t^X(x))\right] < \infty$ holds for all $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$. As was the case in the proof of Lemma 7.2, one may assume that $\mu = 0$ in view of Girsanov's theorem and Hölder's inequality. Then, the properties of standard Brownian motion imply that, for $\mu = 0$, the law of $\Lambda_t^X(x)$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is stochastically dominated in the first order by the law of $\Lambda_t^X(0)$ under $\mathbb{P}$. Furthermore, Lévy's equivalence theorem on Brownian local time and maximum of Brownian motion [19, Theorem 3.6.17] implies that the law of $\Lambda_t^X(0)$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is the same as the law of $X_t^\uparrow$ under $\mathbb{P}$; the latter is also the same as the law of $|X_t|$ under $\mathbb{P}$, for which all exponential moments are finite. □

By Lemma 7.8 and the extension theorem of Daniell-Kolmogorov [19, §2.2A] there exists a probability $\mathbb{Q}$ on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$ such that L_t is the density of $\mathbb{Q}$ with respect to $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_t$ for all $t \in [0,T)$. (Once again, Remark 7.1 becomes relevant at this point.) Since $L = Z/(1-K)$, using (7.9) and (7.10) we obtain the dynamics of L as

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}L_t}{L_t} = \left(-\frac{\left(\partial F_\mu/\partial z\right)\left(T-t, x-X_t\right)}{F_\mu\left(T-t, x-X_t\right)}\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t \leq x\}} + \frac{\left(\partial F_{-\mu}/\partial z\right)\left(T-t, X_t - x\right)}{F_{-\mu}\left(T-t, X_t - x\right)}\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t > x\}}\right)\mathrm{d}\left(X_t - \mu t\right),$$

for $t \in [0,T)$. Then, a straightforward application of Girsanov's theorem and (7.2) imply that, under $\mathbb{Q}$, the dynamics of X are given by

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = \left(G_\mu\left(T-t, x-X_t\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t \leq x\}} - G_{-\mu}\left(T-t, X_t - x\right)\mathbb{I}_{\{X_t > x\}}\right)\mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W_t^\mathbb{Q}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0,T),$$

where $W^{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a standard Brownian motion on $(\Omega, \mathbf{F}, \mathbb{Q})$ and the function G_μ is defined in (7.7).

Remark 7.9. As was the case in Subsection 7.2, when the Brownian motion has zero drift the formulas simplify. In particular, when $\mu = 0$,

$$K_t = 1 - \left(1 - 2\overline{\Phi}\left(\frac{|x|}{\sqrt{T}}\right)\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^t \frac{1}{\sqrt{T-s}} \mathrm{d}\Lambda_s^X(x)\right), \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T)$$

and, under $\mathbb{Q}$, the dynamics of X are given by

$$\mathrm{d}X_t = -\mathsf{sign}(X_t - x) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T-t}} \frac{\phi\left(|X_t - x|/\sqrt{T-t}\right)}{\overline{\Phi}\left(|X_t - x|/\sqrt{T-t}\right)} \right) \mathrm{d}t + \mathrm{d}W_t^{\mathbb{Q}}, \quad \text{for } t \in [0, T).$$

References

[1] M. T. Barlow, *Study of a filtration expanded to include an honest time*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete, 44 (1978), pp. 307–323.

[2] J. Bertoin, *Lévy processes*, vol. 121 of Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

[3] K. Bichteler, *Stochastic integration with jumps*, vol. 89 of Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002.

[4] A. N. Borodin and P. Salminen, *Handbook of Brownian motion—facts and formulae*, Probability and its Applications, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, second ed., 2002.

[5] P. Brémaud and M. Yor, *Changes of filtrations and of probability measures*, Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete, 45 (1978), pp. 269–295.

[6] F. Delbaen and W. Schachermayer, *Arbitrage possibilities in Bessel processes and their relations to local martingales*, Probab. Theory Related Fields, 102 (1995), pp. 357–366.

[7] F. Delbaen and H. Shirakawa, *No arbitrage condition for positive diffusion price processes*, Asia-Pacific Financial Markets, 9 (2002), pp. 159–168.

[8] R. Durrett, *Probability: theory and examples*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, fourth ed., 2010.

[9] R. J. Elliott, M. Jeanblanc, and M. Yor, *On models of default risk*, Math. Finance, 10 (2000), pp. 179–195. INFORMS Applied Probability Conference (Ulm, 1999).

[10] K. D. Elworthy, X. M. Li, and M. Yor, *On the tails of the supremum and the quadratic variation of strictly local martingales*, in Séminaire de Probabilités, XXXI, vol. 1655 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 1997, pp. 113–125.

[11] M. Émery, *Espaces probabilisés filtrés: de la théorie de Vershik au mouvement brownien, via des idées de Tsirelson*, Astérisque, (2002), pp. Exp. No. 882, vii, 63–83. Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 2000/2001.

[12] E. R. Fernholz, *Stochastic portfolio theory*, vol. 48 of Applications of Mathematics (New York), Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability.

[13] H. Föllmer, *The exit measure of a supermartingale*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete, 21 (1972), pp. 154–166.

[14] S. W. He, J. G. Wang, and J. A. Yan, *Semimartingale theory and stochastic calculus*, Kexue Chubanshe (Science Press), Beijing, 1992.

[15] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev, *Local martingales and the fundamental asset pricing theorems in the discrete-time case*, Finance Stoch., 2 (1998), pp. 259–273.

[16] J. Jacod and A. N. Shiryaev, *Limit theorems for stochastic processes*, vol. 288 of Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second ed., 2003.

[17] M. Jeanblanc and S. Song, *An explicit model of default time with given survival probability*, Stochastic Process. Appl., 121 (2011), pp. 1678–1704.

[18] T. Jeulin, *Semi-martingales et grossissement d'une filtration*, vol. 833 of Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 1980.

[19] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve, *Brownian motion and stochastic calculus*, vol. 113 of Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1991.

[20] C. Kardaras, *Numéraire-invariant preferences in financial modeling*, Ann. Appl. Probab., 20 (2010), pp. 1697–1728.

[21] S. Kusuoka, *A remark on default risk models*, in Advances in mathematical economics, Vol. 1 (Tokyo, 1997), vol. 1 of Adv. Math. Econ., Springer, Tokyo, 1999, pp. 69–82.

[22] D. Lando, *On Cox processes and credit risky securities*, Review of Derivatives Research, 2 (1998), pp. 610–612.

[23] P. A. Meyer, *La mesure de H. Föllmer en théorie des surmartingales*, in Séminaire de Probabilités, VI (Univ. Strasbourg, année universitaire 1970–1971; Journées Probabilistes de Strasbourg, 1971), Springer, Berlin, 1972, pp. 118–129. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 258.

[24] A. Nikeghbali and M. Yor, *Doob's maximal identity, multiplicative decompositions and enlargements of filtrations*, Illinois J. Math., 50 (2006), pp. 791–814 (electronic).

[25] K. R. Parthasarathy, *Probability measures on metric spaces*, AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, 2005. Reprint of the 1967 original.

[26] J. Poirot and P. Tankov, *Monte Carlo option pricing for tempered stable (CGMY) processes*, Asia-Pacific Financial Markets, 13 (2006), pp. 327–344.

[27] P. Protter, *Stochastic integration and differential equations*, vol. 2.1 of Applications of Mathematics (New York), Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990. A new approach.

[28] L. C. G. Rogers and D. Williams, *Diffusions, Markov processes, and martingales. Vol. 1*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000. Foundations, Reprint of the second (1994) edition.

[29] J. Ruf, *Heding under arbitrage*. To appear in Mathematical Finance, 2011.

[30] K.-i. Sato, *Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions*, vol. 68 of Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. Translated from the 1990 Japanese original, Revised by the author.

[31] A. N. Shiryaev and A. S. Cherny, *Some distributional properties of a Brownian motion with a drift and an extension of P. Lévy's theorem*, Theory of Probability and its Applications, 44 (2000), pp. 412–418.

[32] B. Tsirel'son, *Within and beyond the reach of Brownian innovation*, in Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. III (Berlin, 1998), no. Extra Vol. III, 1998, pp. 311–320 (electronic).

[33] M. Yor, *Grossissement d'une filtration et semi-martingales: théorèmes généraux*, in Séminaire de Probabilités, XII (Univ. Strasbourg, Strasbourg, 1976/1977), vol. 649 of Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Berlin, 1978, pp. 61–69.

Constantinos Kardaras, Mathematics and Statistics Department, Boston University, 111 Cummington Street, Boston, MA 02215, USA.

E-mail address: `kardaras@bu.edu`